

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 16, 1888.

The Week.

MR. BLAINE landed on Friday, and began his speech-making as usual with a blunder or misstatement so glaring that every business man in the country recognized its parentage at once. Contrasting the business situation of to-day with that of last year, in order to show how mischievous have been the effects of the President's message and the Mills bill, he said that business was prosperous last year, and that we had now entered upon a period of depression. This is not the opinion of the New York *Tribune's* financial editor, however. We put in the deadly parallel the sayings of these two authorities:

MR. BLAINE, AUG. 10.

The year 1887 was prosperous, and the President at its close proposed a radical change in the industrial system which had produced that prosperity, and since that day there has been reversal and confusion in the commerce and manufactures of the United States.

THE TRIBUNE, AUG. 6.

The General Situation.—The general trade reports for the past week were of a satisfactory character, and the volume of business is reported equal to that of the date of last year.

The truth of the matter is, that the *Tribune's* financial estimate of the present state of business, as compared with the period selected by Mr. Blaine, is rather under than over the mark. The trade journals represent the situation as decidedly better than that of last year, and we venture to say that if the business men of the country were polled on the question, ninety-nine in every hundred of them would say at once, and without the smallest hesitation, that there is a marked improvement in trade and industry. *Bradstreet's* issue of Saturday says its special telegrams from leading cities "mark an increase of the improvement in the conditions of trade noticed last week." The same paper furnishes a table of railroad earnings for about two-thirds of the country's railroad mileage, showing that, notwithstanding the rate wars and the interference of the Inter-State Commerce Commission and the State Railroad Commissions, "the earnings from January 1 to June 30 show an increase of .8 per cent. over the first six months of 1887, while over the same periods of 1886 and 1885 they are 13.7 and 22.6 per cent., respectively, greater." Immediately preceding Mr. Blaine's blundering statement of the business situation was another, equally untrue, namely, that he was going to discuss a question on which he is "supposed to have a consistent record." His consistency is that of reckless misrepresentation. Nothing else would be consistency on his part. It is very evident that when he made his speech on Friday evening he had not taken pains to inquire whether business was good or bad, better or worse than last year. It suited his purpose to represent it as being bad, and so he said that it was bad, and took the chances.

It is interesting to contrast the theory of the Republican candidate for Head of the Administration as to the only way in which wages can be reduced with the fact, as stated by Mr. B. F. Jones, late Chairman of the Republican National Committee:

MR. BLAINE, AUGUST 10.

I say here that the wages of the American laborer cannot be reduced except with the consent and with the votes of the American laborer himself.

MR. JONES, JUNE 20.

Our works will close down to-morrow, and remain closed until a satisfactory [that is, a lower] scale is presented to us by the workmen.

The bugle blast of the Greatest Living Statesman was repeated nine times on Monday, with slight variations, and was perceptibly weaker each time. It is noticeable that Mr. Blaine is already shy of using statistics, in which his blunders are so easily exposed, and is confining himself to broad general, rather than specific, untruths concerning the effects of tariff reform and Cleveland's reelection. We no longer find in his speeches his misstatements about the bad effects of Cleveland's policy upon the business of the country, or about the deposits of the wage-earners of Great Britain in savings banks being less than those of Massachusetts. These were the only specific statements that he has made since he began to blow the bugle, and both have been shown to be recklessly false. He confined the blast in eight instances on Monday to a general assertion that the prosperity of the country and the interests of the laboring classes would be injured by a change in tariff policy, but in the ninth he introduced a few fresh variations, saying that the President and his party were "alarmed" because they had discovered that the "mighty host which earns its bread by the sweat of the brow" would resent the "attempt to place wages on the low basis of the European plane," and that "if we have free trade, the factories will not be closed, but if kept open they will be run at half the present wages."

Two pathetic appeals for "fat" in aid of the cause of high protection and free whiskey come to our notice simultaneously. One is, of course, a fresh circular from the prolific and irrepressible James P. Foster, President of the Republican League of the United States. This is dated at the Headquarters, July 30, and, like all of Mr. Foster's utterances, is chiefly noticeable for the frankness with which it "gives away" Republican secrets. "Unless great effort is made in the next three months," says Foster, "there is danger that Grover Cleveland will be reelected." When Foster made this admission, he did not know that Mr. Blaine had discovered that the President and his party were "alarmed." Foster goes on to say: "All we ask of you is a small contribution. Give us the means, and we will do our duty." That is the sentiment of all the Boys in this city—"means" first, duty afterwards. The delay in the forwarding of the means is what is

keeping the Boys' coats so closely upon their backs. The second appeal comes in the form of an editorial article in the Boston *Journal*, in which contributions of a dollar each are solicited. "The wheels," says the *Journal*, with Mr. Foster's "fat" circular evidently in its mind, "must be greased, and the more readily the money is given, the more effective will be the work." Obviously the protected manufacturers are still refusing to be "fried."

Indiana Republicans went to Chicago asking the nomination of Gen. Harrison for President on the ground that it would make the State surely Republican. Ever since General Harrison was nominated, they have been importuning ex-Gov. Porter to accept the nomination for Governor, on the ground that he was the only man who could pull Gen. Harrison through—the Republican candidate for President having proved uncommonly weak in his own State, by reason especially of the bitter opposition to him which has developed on the part of "organized labor." But Mr. Porter would not accept, and the Convention finally pitched upon a man named Hovey, who represents the pension mania in its most offensive form, his chief notoriety coming from the fact that he is an earnest advocate of the "service pension" scheme, which proposes to give a pension to everybody who served in the army. Now somebody is wanted to help Hovey pull Harrison through. Who better than the Greatest Living Statesman, endeared as he is to every true son of Indiana by the famous letter of December 10, 1884, in which he paid a glowing tribute to the State as one in which "it is simply impossible that I can have a fair trial"?

It is encouraging to find Indiana Republicans denouncing the practice of gerrymandering, and demanding "constitutional apportionments whereby the votes of members of all political parties shall be given equal force and effect." Indiana Republicans have not always held these views. In 1872 they carried the State for two Congressmen at large by the trifling majorities of 533 and 126, and the Legislature by a narrow margin in each branch, while the Democrats secured the Governorship. The next State election would involve a United States Senatorship, and the Republican managers concluded that the way to insure that Senatorship was, not to give equal force and effect to the votes of members of all political parties, but to redistrict the State so that the Republican half of the voters would elect thirty out of fifty Senators and fifty-nine out of one hundred Representatives in the Legislature. The outrageous scheme miscarried, as it ought to have done, and the Republicans elected in 1874 only twenty-two Senators and thirty-two Representatives, the Democrats thus securing the United States Senatorship. Naturally enough, a few years later the Democrats improved upon this Repub-

lican example, and made a gerrymander in 1885 which was expected to give them 100 out of 150 members of the Legislature, whereas the Republicans had tried to grab only 89. They ought to have been punished by losing the Legislature altogether, and the Republicans allege that they did on a fair count, although the Republican majority of the United States Senate admitted the Democrat chosen by the narrow majority which the party, by hook or by crook, finally secured in the Legislature.

A few days after the adjournment of the Chicago Convention, Senator Sherman of Ohio was quoted by a newspaper interviewer to the following effect, viz.:

"Henceforth I can say what I please, and it is a great pleasure. This feeling of freedom is so strong with me that I am glad I did not get the nomination."

Strong presumptive evidence of the truth of the foregoing quotation is found in his speech on the Fishery Treaty, published in the *Congressional Record* of Wednesday week, for here the Ohio Senator throws off all disguises, if he ever had any, and comes out squarely for free trade with Canada as the basis and beginning of the political union of the two countries. Hardly anything more effusive can be found in the literature of the day than Mr. Sherman's good feeling towards the Canadians and the whole British world. In fact, Mr. Sherman opposes the ratification of the Fishery Treaty precisely because he thinks it does not go far enough in the direction of amity and brotherly love. It almost takes our breath away to read his fervent ejaculations. And, what is more to the point, there is no doubt that Mr. Sherman is perfectly sincere in all this. He means every word of it. He would cut off the Maine and Michigan lumbermen and the Massachusetts fishermen from the benefits of the tariff with no more compunction than Artemus Ward felt for his wife's relations in the war.

It would not be in keeping with Mr. Sherman's cast of mind if he did not seek to make a point against the Democrats while adopting their policy in part. Accordingly we find him insisting that the Democrats favor the ratification of the pending treaty "because Senators on that side of the house are controlled more or less by party ties in supporting this treaty—because it is a treaty made by a Democratic Administration." It requires considerable hardihood to brush out of sight the distress, we might almost say anguish, that has been endured by Secretary Bayard on this subject ever since the State Department came into his hands—a state of feeling which was and is necessarily shared by his party in Congress—with the dilemma before him and them of a lot of raging fishermen and wild Irishmen on the one side, lashed on by reckless partisans like Senator Frye, and hired attorneys like Judge Woodbury and the late R. S. Spofford, and a possible war with Great Britain on the other side. Only the mutual good will of the two peoples, born of the *Alabama* settlement, of which the last Fishery Treaty was a part, and cultivated by

commerce and travel during the past twenty years, saved us from the hostile attitude which commonly presages war. No thanks to the Senate that we were spared this disturbance, for the Senate prepared and forced upon the House the Retaliation Act, which has not yet been put in force.

The Central Labor Union is discussing the question of making the repeal or modification of the conspiracy laws an issue in the fall campaign. There is a conflict of opinion as to the most expedient way of doing this, but it seems to us that the open, bold way would be the best. Let the Central Labor Union take the field on the broad general ground that the law "must go," that it interferes with boycotting, and makes it difficult for the Walking Delegate to earn his living without work, and let us see what the people will do about it. Thus far the only man outside the Union who has taken his position against the stringency of the law is Gov. Hill. The Legislature refused solidly to follow his lead, and the public generally, so far as it expressed itself, said amen to Mayor Hewitt's warm denunciation of the Governor for coming out on the side of disorder and violence in the settlement of labor disputes. There are many elements in the community, however, which do find laws of almost every kind too severe, and if these could be rallied under a common standard, like "Down with laws!" we have no doubt that they would poll a considerable vote, and no doubt either that the Governor would enter into a "dicker" with them for it as soon as they completed their organization.

The *World* considers that it would be an insult to Gov. Hill to ask him to return to the city treasury the \$10,000 of aqueduct money that he received from one of the contractors. Of course it would be an insult if he did not have the money. It would be an insult to ask him to return it if he was entitled to receive it. In no other sense could it be an insult to ask him to pay it back. The *World* would be much better employed in seconding every honorable effort to get this money back into the city treasury than in throwing stones at those who are making the effort, if any such there be. The fact that he received the money has been sworn to most positively by the contractor who paid it, and has not been denied. Nor is there any doubt or question as to the source and origin of this money. It was part of an extra sum, over and above a fair compensation, obtained from the city for work on the new aqueduct. This is as plain as A B C. The only explanation of this affair that we have ever heard was, that the Governor used the money to pay his campaign expenses. We have been waiting to see whether the Governor would put in this plea in abatement himself, but he has not done so.

The simultaneous retirement of Sir George Stephen and Mr. L. P. Morton from the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the former as President and the latter

as a director, has been made the subject of no little comment. 'Sir George, it is said by one set of commentators, goes out in order to give the chief place to Vice-President Van Horne, an American citizen of much renown in the railroad world. It is believed that Mr. Van Horne's accession to the Presidency of this great corporation will dull the edge of criticism in the United States, and tend to prevent hostile action in Congress of the sort prefigured in Senator Cullom's speech. Mr. Morton's resignation is ascribed to patriotism and a natural desire to get votes. He was succeeded by Senator McInness of New Westminster, British Columbia. So by a concerted movement one Canadian made room for an American and one American made room for a Canadian. There is very little room for fault-finding here—certainly none as against Mr. Morton.

M. de Molinari calls attention, in the July number of the *Journal des Économistes*, to the reward which England is now reaping for her steadfast adherence to the policy of free trade, in the face of the protectionist movement which has swept over all Europe. For a time English industries were considerably embarrassed by losing a portion of their former market in Germany, France, and Austria. In those countries, on the other hand, a temporary impulse was given to production and to foreign trade by the stimulus of a protective tariff and bounties. But the impulse could be, and has been, but temporary. Taxed provisions and materials of manufacture have had their necessary outcome in higher cost of production, and England's adherence to free trade, although paying higher wages, is putting her at the front again. For the first five months of this year, English imports show a gain over the corresponding period of 1887 of \$39,875,000, and exports a gain, of \$33,300,000. For the same months, France, on the contrary, has lost \$13,000,000 and \$4,000,000 in imports and exports respectively. The foreign trade of Germany, though showing a slight gain, is only improved by comparison with a very bad preceding year, and is really at no higher point than in 1883. The London *Economist* had already commented on the decided looking up of England's foreign commerce, and had remarked that it would prove a serious setback to the "fair-traders."

The protectionist agitation in Spain has assumed its most formidable shape in the so-called Agrarian League. This organization is not made up of land-owners alone, but appears to be a political catch-all, designed for the convenience of all who agree in demanding a higher tariff, no matter how widely they may differ on other points. With the farmers who complain bitterly of their heavy taxation and their inability to compete with foreign agricultural products, and who clamor for higher duties on breadstuffs, are associated manufacturers who cry out that in spite of the tariff on the goods they make being higher than any other in Europe, they are being ruined by the slight reductions

made in pursuance of commercial treaties, and owners of real estate who call for a reduction of their taxes to the extent of \$10,000,000, the amount to be made good to the Government by heavier customs duties and by taxing personal property and bonds. With these demands go hand in hand, as usual, appeals for extravagant State expenditures in aid of internal improvements. At the head of the movement is Señor Gamazo, ex-Minister of Public Works, representing the agricultural constituency of Old Castile. He has a following of thirty deputies and as many Senators, all from agricultural and manufacturing provinces. So great headway has the agitation made as to draw into its support such Conservatives as De Torenó, Villaverde, and Canovas, Liberals of prominence like Romero y Robledo and Montillo, and at least one leading Republican, Muro of Old Castile. In addition to the prevailing agricultural depression, as ground of complaint and appeal, the protectionists make a great deal of the considerable falling off in foreign trade which has marked the past three years. Altogether, this compact Agrarian League promises to be a powerful political organization.

Prime Minister Sagasta meets its demands with partial concessions. He proposes to take off \$3,600,000 of the taxes laid on real estate and agriculture. He promises to get lower rates of freight on the railroads for products of farm and mine? He accepts the programme for extensive public works, and undertakes to stimulate foreign commerce in all possible ways. But he declares that the main demand, viz., that for higher duties, cannot be granted without a violation of national faith. The light reductions in customs duties which have been made are, he points out, parts of solemn treaty obligations entered into with twenty different countries in the course of the last twenty years. That the foreign trade of Spain has quadrupled during that period is, he claims, a direct result of the more liberal policy. Acknowledging the severe agricultural depression, he shows that it is not confined to Spain, but is universal in Europe, and remarks that it must be overcome by the use of better methods rather than by raising the tariff. If Spain has exposed some of her industries to a sharper competition by relaxing her tariff restrictions, she has, at the same time, gained a greatly expanded market for those products in which she can defy competition—viz., olive oil, wine, raisins, and ores.

Lord Salisbury's speech at the banquet in London on Thursday seems to have dissipated whatever remained of the war scare of a year ago. Our readers may remember that the belief that war was sure to break out last spring was widely prevalent in Europe, even among the best informed observers, during the whole of the winter of 1887-8. It was due largely to the continued dissatisfaction of Russia with the state of things in Bulgaria, and to the fear that she would take advantage of the French desire for revenge

to form an alliance with the Republic, and use it to paralyze Germany while she worked her own will in the Balkan peninsula. At that time Boulanger was still taken seriously in France. The air was full of accounts of his achievements as an organizer, and somehow his horsemanship also spread the idea that he would prove a great commander in time of war. In one way or another, in fact, the expectation of another great European struggle of the nations, became stronger than it had been at any time since 1869. Bismarck did much to pour oil on the waters by his triple alliance with Austria and Italy. This was his answer to the threatenings on the side of France. He frankly published the treaty, which showed that he was determined to have peace, even if he had to fight for it. The quieting effect of this was at once apparent. Russian activity in Bulgaria began to diminish, and so did Boulanger's popularity in France as a military man.

It is curious, but it is a fact, that Boulanger's conversion into a politician, and the transfer of his interest from foreign to domestic affairs, began almost simultaneously with Bismarck's notice that he was ready for France or Russia at any time. Boulanger henceforth began to occupy himself with the defects of "parlementarisme," and with the revision of the Constitution, rather than with the best means of conquering Germany. His course since then, too, has undoubtedly had a strongly sedative effect on Russia. The facility with which he became a budding Cæsar, and the panic which he for some weeks spread among the Republican politicians, were to all foreigners an unmistakable sign that France was still afflicted with serious internal weakness, and was not to be counted on as a reliable ally in any European conflict. In other words, the Boulanger episode made unmistakably for peace. Another agency which has helped to restore the feeling of security, has been the steady and persistent disregard of the Bulgarians for Russian, and indeed all foreign, threats. Whether their course has been dictated by simple bullheadedness or by political sagacity, matters little. The fact is, that the little people which only emerged from mediæval darkness and barbarism within ten years, has astonished all Europe by its independence and capacity for self-government. Probably nothing in the whole situation has done as much to disconcert Russian plans as this revelation, because it has furnished Austria and England with materials for protests against interference which, in these days of public opinion, even the master of a hundred legions cannot disregard.

The discussions started in the French press by the result of the Boulanger-Floquet duel are very interesting illustrations of manners. Our forecast of the effect it would have in discrediting Boulanger in the popular mind has been fully justified by the event. The latest *Figaro* has an article on the subject, in which it enlarges at some length on the disgrace for a military man

of being beaten with the sword by a *péquin*—the French military slang name for a civilian. It says: "The defeat of a general by a civilian has seemed to all classes, 'bourgeois' as well as 'people,' so complete, so crushing, so unexpected, that one of our friends heard on the same day, within an interval of two hours, a workingman claim for M. Floquet the chief command of the national forces by sea and land, and a Boulangerist concierge (janitor) exclaim, 'What a misfortune! They must have dipped M. Floquet's blade in poison.'" The army men, it says, suffered still more keenly—repeating with a groan, "A general beaten by a *péquin*!" The *Figaro* tries to cheer them up by recalling other occasions on which civilians have got the better of military men with the small sword, and notably the duel between M. de Lauriston and the Marquis de Gallifet. Lauriston was a civilian sixty years old, and Gallifet a distinguished young cavalry officer. He accused Lauriston of staring at his wife at the theatre in an unbecoming manner. Lauriston slapped his face, and soon after wounded him severely.

The writer then goes on to explain how it is that French soldiers are exposed to these mortifying defeats at the hands of civilians. The reason is, that fencing is compulsory in the army three times a week, and, therefore, like all compulsory things, is distasteful, and that the halls provided for the purpose are dreary, ill-lighted, and poorly furnished, and in winter very cold. Consequently, it says, among the fencers of renown in Paris, all of whom are well known to the public, there is not a single military man. To be a good fencer needs from two hours to two hours and a half every day—in other words, as much as good piano playing or dancing. Of this, one hour is given to actual practice, and another to bathing, dressing, and cooling off. For this a soldier has not the leisure. The best fencers in Paris to-day are to be found in two classes, the rich young men, who take to the small sword as one of their daily amusements, and the Government and bankers' and lawyers' clerks, and the brokers, who are at liberty after four or five o'clock, and are apt to fill up the time before dinner with a bout with the foils. The three crack fencers are Baron Ezpeleta and M. Aldama, both men of leisure, and a young stockbroker named Vavas seur. M. Floquet took up fencing within a year, after twenty years of disuse, under the doctor's orders, but he was known in the *salles d'armes* as a mere "mazette," or butter-fingers. The comparative indifference to the art in the army is ascribed also to the fact that in active service it is the sabre only which is worn, and most men use the sabre in a *mêlée* to cut and slash, and not to point, although every French writer on cavalry dwells with solemnity upon the duty of pointing and not cutting in a charge. But pointing when a man is approaching an adversary whose blade is swinging high in air requires more coolness and experience than most men have.

THE CAMPAIGN.

THE Leader of the Party having arrived, the Republican canvass, now opens. For several weeks the stage has been occupied by amateurs, the star being a comical actor from Indianapolis, who has delivered with the greatest impressiveness the emptiest nothings ever uttered. The country has watched his antics with mingled curiosity and amusement, while awaiting the return of the great professional. He came on Friday, and with his first words brushed aside the amateurs. "The political campaign on which we are about to enter," was the notice which he served on all concerned, that the Indianapolis business was a farce which was now ended.

The total effacement of the Nominal Candidate is the most striking and the most impressive feature of the situation. The name of Benjamin Harrison appears at the head of the Republican ticket, but that is his only part in the canvass. His position, indeed, closely resembles that of the Presidential elector in ordinary campaigns. Usually the voter who desires a certain man to be President, votes a ticket containing a list of Presidential electors practically pledged to vote in their turn for the man whom the voter desires to see at the head of the Administration. In like manner this year the voter who wants to see Mr. Blaine Head of the Administration, will vote the ticket of Harrison Presidential electors; but everybody understands that Gen. Harrison is expected to act only as caretaker of the White House. So far as the personal issue is concerned, it is simply between an administration dominated by Grover Cleveland, on the one side, and an administration dominated by James G. Blaine, on the other.

On the burning question of the tariff the two parties present a clear-cut issue. The Democrats propose a well-considered measure, which puts sundry raw materials, notably wool, lumber, and salt, upon the free list, and reduces the duties on a number of other articles. They advocate these changes on the ground that the freeing of raw materials would promote manufactures, and that the proposed reduction of duties on other articles would benefit the masses of the people. The Republican platform, on the other hand, commits the party to the maintenance of the existing protective system, even if that policy requires the total abolition of the internal-revenue system, and the flooding of the country with cheap whiskey. An attempt has been made by the Republican Senators to substitute some other doctrine, through the passage by that branch of a tariff bill which would reduce the duties on some articles and remove those on some others; but the difficulties in the way have already proved so great that they now threaten to be insuperable. The Leader of the Party evidently so regards them, for he treats the matter as settled by the Chicago platform. The setting aside of a platform by a party between convention and election is a thing which never has occurred, and it is safe to say that it will not occur this year. The Democrats made their appeal to the country upon the declaration of principles adopted at

St. Louis; the Republicans theirs upon that adopted at Chicago. The voters will decide between the two policies.

Upon the issue thus presented the Republicans appeal to greed and ignorance, the Democrats to public spirit and intelligence. The President of the Republican League of the United States has given the world the testimony of "a Republican United States Senator" that "the manufacturers get practically the sole benefit of the tariff laws," and the Republicans seek the support of Democratic manufacturers on the ground of their selfish interests. Whenever one says, as Pierce Kane, a Democratic knit-goods manufacturer of Rensselaer County, said: "I know what my own interests are, and will do my best to protect them. I am voting for Kane," he is hailed as a patriot. Along with this appeal to the pocket of the manufacturer, who gets "practically the sole benefit of the tariff laws," goes an appeal to the fears of his employees, by what is known in political parlance as "working the free-trade racket." This is the attempt to frighten the workingmen into voting for the high-tariff and free-whiskey party by the threat that the country will go to ruin, and they will lose their places, if a moderate reduction in the tariff is made.

The Democrats do not advocate their cause on the ground that its success would swell still larger the immense fortunes of a small number of protected manufacturers like Andrew Carnegie, but on the ground that it would promote the interests of the great mass of the American people. They still hold to the old-fashioned notion that taxation is a bad thing, of which the less the better, and that an economical administration of the Government is preferable to a policy of reckless extravagance. The loud cries with which the "free-trade scare" is raised, they meet by quiet arguments showing the advantage to the community of free raw materials and low duties, quoting the unanswerable words on this side in the past of nearly all the great Republican leaders.

Leader and policy are ideally suited to each other in each party. The Republican candidate for Head of the Administration is just the man to represent a cause that appeals to the greed of a small ring of men whose only idea of the Government is that of a machine to make money for its "friends," and to the ignorance of the workingmen, whom among themselves they laugh at as they plan to dupe them. The Democratic candidate is just the man to represent a cause which appeals to the intelligence and good sense of the mass of the people—a plain man, without a particle of "magnetism" or "brilliance," doing what he conceives to be his duty without regard to the danger of its costing him a reelection (Mr. Blaine himself concedes that Mr. Cleveland would probably have been reelected if he had not written his tariff message), trusting his fortunes to the "plain people."

THE HOME-MARKET FALLACY.

GEN. GRANT refers somewhere in his Memoirs to the great variety of antiquated fire-

arms called into use by the sudden outbreak of the civil war, and the observation might be applied to the vigorous controversy over the tariff question into which the country has now plunged. The exigencies of debate bring out arguments of all kinds, some of which are about as effective in the present discussion as arquebuses and culverins would be in modern warfare, and their production is a striking proof of the long dearth of serious issues in our politics. Perhaps as remarkable a specimen as any of this kind of argument is what may be called the home-market fallacy. This fallacy consists in inferring that, since the home market is the best for the products of a country, it is the best policy to shut off the foreign market. It is urged that, if we sell goods to foreigners, taking their goods in exchange, we are enabling them to employ their capital at a profit and furnishing wages to their laborers, while if we sold the goods to our own people, we should be giving a profit to home capital and wages to home labor—a course so obviously beneficial to the whole country as to demand legislative enactment.

This argument—the premises of which must have been fished out of the 'Wealth of Nations' by some scholarly protectionist—may not seem to deserve serious discussion; but, as it is quite commonly advanced by very honest people, and as its examination lets in a great deal of light upon the main question, it is advisable to scrutinize it with care. It really contradicts the fundamental principle upon which all commerce, and, in fact, all modern industry rest—the principle, namely, of the division of labor. We may best get at the heart of the matter by asking why it is that the farmer nowadays does not, as he once did, make his own clothes. It is obvious that, if he combed and spun and wove his own wool, he would be employing his own capital and furnishing wages to the laborers of his own family. He would save the expense of transporting the wool to a market, and transporting the clothes back again; he would not be paying a profit to the woollen manufacturer or wages to his workmen, and would, in short, be enjoying all the advantages of a home market in the highest possible degree. What has induced the farmers of the world to sacrifice all these advantages? Simply the fact that they have found that they could get more and better clothes by making this sacrifice. They have found that they obtained a higher profit upon their capital and better wages for their labor by producing, not clothes, but articles which they exchanged for clothes. It is true that a protective tariff tends to compel them to accept the advantages of the home market by making them accept worse and fewer clothes in exchange for their products than they would receive if trade were free; but the advantages of the division of labor are so much greater than those of the home market, that farmers still find that it does not pay them to make their own clothes.

What is true of individuals is true, although to a less extent, of communities. According to the home-market theory, the people of Massachusetts and the people of

Minnesota are making a great mistake in exchanging their products with one another. The shoemakers of the East ought to exchange their shoes for flour produced in their own region, since thus they would give employment to home capital and labor; and the farmers of the West should for the same reason barter their flour for shoes produced in the West. But it is clear that in such case the Eastern manufacturers and the Western farmers would both be worse off than before. Massachusetts is a poor place for growing wheat, but it is from several causes a very good place for making shoes; and Minnesota has much greater advantages in wheat-raising than in shoemaking. If the home-market theory be true, nothing can be more ruinous to a country than the construction of railroads. Without them the shoemakers of Massachusetts would be compelled to exchange with the farmers of Massachusetts, and the people of Minnesota would have to make their own shoes or go barefoot. There would be more "home market" in both cases, but there would be fewer commodities, fewer people, and lower profits and wages.

The plausibility of this fallacy is due to the ambiguous terms in which it is expressed. It is assumed that the home capital and labor to which the tariff is to give employment are somehow created by the tariff, and it is implied that they would be unemployed unless the tariff gave them employment. But the imposition of taxes cannot create new capital. It can only divert capital from existing channels into new ones, and, by the very theory of protection, in these new channels the ordinary rate of profit cannot be obtained. If it could, capital would enter them of its own accord. Capital thus diverted may earn a profit, but it is earned by a comparative reduction of the rates of profit and wages current in the community at large.

After the establishment of a protective tariff there is no more capital than there was before. There are no more laborers. There is less "foreign market," and experience shows that it is not even certain that there will be more "home market." If the foreign market were entirely cut off, the total production of the country would not be increased but diminished, for a portion of the capital of the country that was formerly employed at a profit would then be employed at a comparative loss. The home market creates itself whenever there is any profit in it; and when there is none, Congress cannot produce it. The only way to enlarge the home market is to allow the greatest possible freedom to our citizens in the employment of their capital. They will be very certain to cease trading with foreigners whenever they can make more by trading at home, and nothing but loss can follow from the attempt of the Government to control their business.

TRUSTS.

THE people of the United States are beginning to realize that the situation in which they are placed, by the Trusts and Combines

multiplying around them, is very serious. The preliminary report of the Congressional Committee on this subject is a confession that up to this time no way has been discovered to relieve the public from the exactions of these new-fangled monopolists. The legal position of the Trusts is apparently impregnable. They have all the existing apparatus for making certain staple articles indispensable to civilized society, such as refined sugar, cotton bagging, steel rails, illuminating oils, etc. There are forty or fifty of these constrictors, organized in one way and another, all squeezing the life out of that patient ox, the public.

A suit at law has been begun against one of them in this State to dissolve certain corporations that have been amalgamated into a Trust. The prosecution of this suit will occupy not less than three years, probably much more, and, if successfully maintained, will dissolve the wicked corporations. But how will that achievement help the public? The property of the dissolved corporation does not become public property. It still belongs to the owners. Suppose that it is a sugar-refining company. Its existence as a corporation comes to an end, its machinery and assets are sold in order that the proceeds may be divided among the shareholders. Its chief, perhaps its sole shareholder, is the Trust. Of course the Trust can bid more for the property than anybody else, because the proceeds fall into its own treasury. What the Trust wants is the property, not the charter. If there is anything it can easily dispense with, it is the corporate title. There are probably some corporations amalgamated into Trusts which the Trusts would be glad to have dissolved at the expense and by the authority of the State, as, for example, those which have a few discontented, impracticable stockholders.

The dissolution of an incorporated company is an operation of extreme delicacy and difficulty, as has been found by those who have ever attempted to freeze out a minority interest, however small. We can imagine that the Trusts would be exceedingly obliged to the State for taking the job off their hands, eliminating all disturbing elements, and handing the property over to them. A corporate franchise is in no way essential to a Trust. Incorporated companies have been picked up and brought into these "combines," not because that particular form of holding was desired, but because it was actually in existence. It was easier to take it as it was than to change its form and its legal relations. But in the case of a property where division of ownership is not desired, and where personal liability for debts is not apprehended, a charter from the State is manifestly superfluous. No Trust has sought to have itself incorporated. No Trust, we venture to say, cares a farthing whether its subordinate corporations are disincorporated or not.

If there is no relief coming from lawsuits, or from this kind of a lawsuit, is any to be expected from the force of domestic competition? In the long run, the very long run, we should say yes. Yet it is by no means certain. The argument in favor of competition as

sumes that whenever the Trust or Combine advances the price of its product beyond a fair remuneration for the capital, labor, and skill employed, other capital, labor, and skill will come into the field and bring down prices and profits to the normal level. This is the doctrine usually held by economists; but economists recognize equally the truth of Stephenson's maxim, that where combination is possible, competition is impossible. The vital and real question is whether in any given case—that of the Standard Oil Trust, for example—combination will continue to be possible, say, for a whole generation. If so, then for that generation it is the same as though it were possible for ever. The Standard Oil Trust has lasted twenty years. He would be a bold man who should say that it would not last ten years longer—and this notwithstanding the immense extension, development, increase, and variation of the oil business during the period. But in the case of the Standard Oil Trust the fear of competition has had the effect to keep down the price of oil, so that it might not have been lower under any condition of trade. But it may not always be so. The fear of competition will always be in proportion to its imminence. The Sugar Trust, the Cotton Bagging Trust, the Dental Trade Combine are evidently under no such fear.

It would seem to be a very simple proposition to fight these Trusts and Combines in every way possible, to repeal duties where they are sheltered by the tariff, and to fight them in other ways where they are not so protected. All of them are protected by the tariff except three—the Standard Oil, the Cotton Seed Oil, and the Whiskey Trusts. As to these three articles, we have had, up to this time, such a substantial monopoly of the raw material that foreign competition was out of the question. The situation of the producers was, for monopolizing purposes, as satisfactory as though they had had a prohibitory duty against foreign petroleum, cottonseed oil, and whiskey. It is freely acknowledged that no change in the tariff can disturb them. The Republican leaders in Congress have seized upon this fact to excuse themselves from taking any action tariff-wise against the forty or fifty other Trusts. In reply to every demand for lower duties on the trust-protected articles they have said, "What are you going to do about Standard Oil and cotton oil and whiskey—how are you going to hit them?" This is like saying: "You have the potato-bug, and the army-worm, and the grasshopper, and many other pests ravaging your fields, but unless you can devise means for getting rid of all of them at once, we will not attack any of them. Show us a sure cure for the grasshopper, and it will be time enough to talk about exterminating the potato-bug and the army-worm." This was the substance of the argument made by Mr. Reed of Maine and others in the House before the Chicago platform was adopted.

Now comes the blessed platform, and expressly declares that no Trust shall be attacked by the repeal or reduction of duties on the articles that it has monopolized. We quote the words again:

"If there shall still remain a larger revenue than is requisite for the wants of the Government, we favor the entire repeal of the internal-revenue system rather than the surrender of any part of our protective system."

This is all that the Trusts want. Since the platform was adopted, the Trusts have multiplied like the plagues of Egypt, and those that existed before have put up their prices to the top notch, taking everything that the Tariff allows. All that they wanted was some official declaration that they would not be disturbed tariff-wise. They could take care of everything else if the Republican party would guarantee them at this corner. They had no fear that the courts would enjoin them from charging more than 5½ cents a pound for sugar, or more than 8 cents a pound for cotton bagging, and so on. The shingle-makers on the Pacific Coast had no apprehensions that the courts would order them to desist from organizing a Trust, and accordingly they hustled together to form one as soon as they read the assurance that there was not to be any even the smallest change in "our protective system." Our protective system is the tariff as it is, in all its parts—sugar, shingles, cotton bagging, steel rails, steel beams, and every other thing that is or can be "trusted," combined, monopolized. No wonder the Trusts increase and multiply on every hand and in every direction.

THE TARIFF ON BOOKS.

THE clause in the Mills bill, as it passed the House of Representatives, which relates to the free importation of books, reads as follows: "Bibles, books, and pamphlets printed in other languages than English, and books and pamphlets, and all publications of foreign governments, and publications of foreign societies, historical or scientific, printed for gratuitous distribution." This wording and punctuation (which accords with the edition of the bill printed, after it had passed the House of Representatives, by order of the Senate) leaves room for differences of construction.

The interpretation given to the paragraph by the members of Congress who are responsible for its introduction and present form is that it includes: (1) Bibles printed in any language or languages; (2) all books and pamphlets printed in other languages than English; (3) all books and pamphlets printed abroad for gratuitous distribution, without regard to their language; (4) all publications of foreign governments in whatsoever language, if distributed gratuitously; and (5) all publications of foreign historical or scientific societies (in any language) when these are printed for gratuitous distribution. Concerning this construction of the paragraph, it may be remarked that the limitation of free importation of gratuitous society publications to such as are by "historical" or "scientific" societies, would seem to conflict with the provision that all books and pamphlets printed for gratuitous distribution are to be included. Indeed, the fifth provision, coming after this latter stipulation, seems superfluous, except in so far as "publications" may be meant to include

other works than are covered by the words "books and pamphlets," such as maps or engravings, for example. One might question, also, the intention of the words "printed for gratuitous distribution" as applied to the publications of societies; but presumably the Committee meant to designate the works distributed to subscribing members of societies, notwithstanding that the subscription had been paid to cover the cost of such publications. The Senate Committee, it is said on good authority, have stricken out the word "Bibles," evidently interpreting the clause to include Bibles printed in English only when they are issued for gratuitous distribution—holding, presumably, that when they are printed for sale in any other language, they are covered by the description "books" in the second provision, and do not require, therefore, to be specially designated.

In the detailed consideration of the bill by the House of Representatives, this clause was reached on Thursday, June 28, and—modest as its provisions will seem to scholars and lovers of books, and to all who desire the spread of knowledge—it was not allowed to be passed without opposition. Mr. Farquhar of New York put himself upon record as opposing the first timid step taken by Congress to lighten the burden placed upon every American citizen who is struggling after wisdom, by the imposition of a tariff upon knowledge. Mr. Farquhar, it seems, has discovered that to put "Bibles printed in other languages than English, and books and pamphlets, and all publications of foreign governments, and publications of foreign societies, historical and scientific, printed for gratuitous distribution" upon the free list, is "strictly in the line of enlightened public intelligence," and is "proper and correct in all respects"; but a proposition to allow the many thousand intelligent American citizens who do not despise knowledge because it is made public in a foreign language, to import their books free from taxation, he considers "unfair to the American publisher, and the American printer, and booksellers, and bookbinders, and all persons engaged in the manufacture of books"—not because they make these same foreign books, it should be noted, but because they print, or bind, or sell some kind of books.

The logic of Mr. Farquhar's argument is, therefore, that our Government exercises its best judgment in levying a tax upon the works containing the learning and wisdom of the great men of Europe, in order that its citizens may be encouraged to buy in place of them any poor trash whatsoever, the printing of which will afford a living to Mr. Farquhar's old compatriots of the typographical unions. "In the admission of Bibles printed in foreign languages free, there is manifest propriety," Mr. Farquhar repeats, "and no one can find fault with that"; but we should much like to know where he discovered the "enlightened public intelligence" which argues that the foreign-born immigrant to this country is to have his Bible free, while the poor native-born American citizen is to be taxed one-quarter the cost of his, although this tax

only goes to increase our dangerous surplus.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania, who has been in the House long enough to have argued on both sides of tariff reform, seemed concerned because this paragraph would permit the free importation of the publications of the Cobden Club. He knew, moreover, the name of one publisher of foreign books in this country who would have to "close" his business upon the passage of this paragraph of the Mills bill (we trust the Philadelphia publisher who is named properly appreciates this view of his solvency), and he had learned of several other "large establishments engaged wholly in the production of books and pamphlets in foreign languages," and predicted that similar catastrophes would overtake them; but when asked to name them, he could only hazard the name of Scribner & Company. Mr. Townshend of Illinois wished to know if he was willing to "put a tax upon knowledge just to benefit two or three large firms," whereupon Mr. Kelley could only declare: "I stand by the American paper-maker, printer, type-founder, book-binder, whether he is engaged in printing and binding books in English or in a foreign language." To which Mr. Townshend promptly responded, "At the expense of the dissemination of knowledge."

In answer to Mr. Townshend's repeated questions as to the publication of German school-books in this country (the drift of the inquiry not being detected), Mr. Farquhar hastened to the Library of Congress, and returned with certain volumes as ocular proof that German text-books were published in the United States. Thereupon Mr. Townshend turned upon him with the remark: "I would like to have the gentleman tell me how it is that school-books published in the protective-tariff country of Germany can be published there and brought into this country to compete with the books published here. There is a higher protective tariff in Germany than there is in this country. How can they publish books in Germany and import them into this country and be successful in competition with ours? It seems to me, Mr. Chairman," Mr. Townshend concluded, "there is an effort here to put a tax on knowledge in this country." There was no answer at hand to this home thrust.

It is a pleasure to turn, from such shallow opposition, to the intelligent and forcible argument in favor of the paragraph made by Mr. Breckinridge of Kentucky. He considers the step proposed "as short a step as the American Congress ought to be willing to take"; and instead of striking out anything from the provision, Mr. Breckinridge would add to it, and "make all literature free. . . . I regret that we do not see our way clear to go further than we have in this provision. I wish that we thought that we were able to make all books, all art, all productions of human genius, in print, or picture, or sculpture, free." After stating the true nature of the provision, Mr. Breckinridge exclaims: "Surely no one will go to the extent of saying that taxes and

duties ought to be levied on learning simply for the purpose of protection. Protection ought not to go so far as to make the means of knowledge more expensive merely for the purpose of taxation, and that, too, at a time when there is no necessity for the tax, and when we are removing taxation. In the effort to eliminate subjects of taxation, in trying to reduce the revenue by assorting the subjects upon which the taxes are laid, what better subject for release from duty can possibly be found than good books? From what can we possibly take the burden better than from a tool for education? From what could we in this nineteenth century better take taxation off than knowledge?" The effort to strike out this clause Mr. Breckinridge denounces as "protection gone mad," and it is pronounced as being "of a piece with the effort to keep books from the slave or the Bible from the people."

Mr. Farquhar's amendment, to strike out the provision that books and pamphlets printed in other languages than English should be permitted free importation, was defeated by 70 yeas to 53 nays. It now remains to be seen what the Senate will do with this paragraph of the Tariff Bill, which is of such vital interest to every American student and scholar.

FAST TRAIN SERVICE.

RECENT improvements in the train service between London and Edinburgh have made it the fastest in the world. Three years ago there was some doubt as to the relative speed of the best English and American passenger trains. Even then, the best judges thought that the balance was slightly in favor of England; to-day it is distinctly so. The West Coast Route (London and Northwestern Railway) runs a train 400 miles in eight hours. On the opening day this train arrived at its destination eight minutes ahead of time, having made the run at the rate of 50.23 miles an hour, including stops, or 53.5 miles, excluding stops.

The first of these figures is quite without precedent for the distance in question, or in fact for any long-distance run. The last is not. There is at least one American record which surpasses it in many particulars. On the West Shore Road, July 9, 1885, a special train a trifle heavier than the Scotch express was run from East Buffalo to Weehawken, 422.6 miles in 9 hours and 23 minutes, including 20 stops. A special train, arranged on short notice, was of course liable to detentions of this kind. It is said that 1 hour and 34 minutes was lost in this way. Making this deduction, and deducting in the same way the time lost by the English train, we have the following results:

	Distance. miles.	Time. H. M.	Running rate. Miles per hour.
L. & N. W. . . .	400	7 25	53.60
West Shore.	422.6	7 49	54.06

These results are practically equal; for we suspect that the time allowance for stops was computed in a manner which gave a slight advantage to the West Shore. But certain parts of the West Shore run were better than

anything in that of the London and Northwestern, sixty-one miles from Buffalo to Genesee Junction being made in fifty-six minutes actual time, or at the rate of sixty-five and one-quarter miles an hour. The last part of this run was made at a rate of from 83 to 87 miles an hour; while the maximum attained in the English run was only about 75 miles an hour. Two hundred and one and seven-tenth miles from Buffalo to Frankfort, with eight full stops (besides five partial ones), were made in an actual time but slightly greater than that required in England for the same run with one stop, and at an average running speed, excluding stops, barely under sixty miles an hour. This record, though ignored in some English accounts of railroad speed, is thoroughly well attested. It is decidedly the best we have. A Grand Trunk special of June, 1886, is said to have made 229½ miles in 237 minutes, excluding stops, or 58½ miles an hour; but this, even if thoroughly well established, does not equal the record of the West Shore.

But of regular trains we have none which can come anywhere near the English record in this matter. The best for the distance in question is the Chicago Limited, from New York to Buffalo, which takes 10 hours 45 minutes to run 440 miles—a weak showing as compared with the 400 miles within 8 hours on the London and Northwestern. The best of the Washington expresses now takes 5 hours and 18 minutes to make the 226 miles between Jersey City and Washington. But the distance in this case is much shorter, and the time record far from equals that of the best English trains. For short distances, especially between New York and Philadelphia and between Baltimore and Washington, we have had trains scheduled to run at rates above fifty miles an hour; but the conditions of short-distance running are more favorable for high speeds.

It seems clear that we can make as good time as they do in England; it is also clear that we do not. The reason is not one of engineering, but of finance. As far as construction goes, the English have not so great an advantage over our best roads as is commonly supposed. Their one distinct point of superiority is freedom from grade crossings. A large part of the enormous cost of English track has been due to this cause. It is questionable whether their track is straighter or more level than ours. In the absence of accessible statistics, no one can speak positively, but it is pretty certain that the profile and alignment of the English roads are not so good as is generally supposed, and probably not as easy as those of many American lines. In finish of track the English of course have a great advantage, as well as in many of the details of operation; but it is open to doubt whether their equipment is as good as ours except for a very narrow range of purposes. On the whole, the advantages and disadvantages are not far from equal.

But the English are willing to pay for fast trains, while we are not. Let it be observed that this is not merely a question of rates of

fares, or even of passenger-train receipts, but a general question of traffic economy. The direct expense of running a fast train, large as it is, by no means measures the total cost. Other traffic is inconvenienced and rendered more expensive. The labor of trackmen is indirectly increased. If the community wishes to have fast trains, all this must be somehow paid for. England does pay for it; America does not.

It is a common complaint of Englishmen that railroad rates, and especially railroad freight rates, are higher in proportion to the work done than they are in any other country. This fact is closely connected with the speed of English train service. It often costs more to do common work with a first-class instrument than with a common one. And it is in like manner legitimate that it should cost more to ship freight on a road crowded with high-grade passenger traffic than on one built and operated for cheap freight service.

Passenger-train service at rates above forty miles an hour is, from the point of view of the public, a luxury; from the point of view of the railroad company, it is largely of the nature of an advertisement. In America, at any rate, it is resorted to rather as a means of obtaining incidental advantages on other business than from any direct profit in the business itself. The case stands somewhat in this way: The public demands rapid travel, but does not make it pay. The roads must meet the public demand, or fall behind in public esteem. The public in a general way fixes a standard of fast service which it demands. If it fixes this standard high, it indirectly pays a high price for it. If it is content with less, it pays less for its railroad service as a whole. These demands are pitched high in England and lower in the United States. There are some other reasons for the difference. The density of population in England makes fast passenger service better business policy there than it is here, and makes low-grade freight traffic relatively less profitable. But the reason first given is probably the chief factor in producing the result.

The highest speed is rarely attained by anything like voluntary action on the part of the railroad management. It is almost always the result of competition. The present service between London and Edinburgh is the result of an active struggle of this kind. Naturally enough, the fast trains are pretty much confined to England and America. In countries with private monopoly, like France, they are rare; in countries with State monopoly, like Germany, they are rarer still. The State does not feel the need of advertising, and can suit its service to its notions of what the public ought to demand. Only in international matters does it feel the stimulus of competition; only in connection with international routes when there was some positive rivalry, has train service been accelerated in central Europe in the past ten years.

This state of things has its good and its bad side. It is good to prevent waste of money on what is a mere advertisement or an unduly expensive luxury. It is bad if it

takes away the stimulus to a higher standard of railroad efficiency, or if it measures the value of rapid transit solely by the train-mile receipts. For train receipts do not measure its whole value to the nation, any more than train expenses measure its whole cost to the railroads.

FATNESS.

PROBABLY no question of personal hygiene has occupied so much attention from laymen or laywomen as the question how to avoid growing fat. Doctors, we think, as a rule take little interest in it as long as it does not result in some form of illness. About the inconvenience of being fat, there is generally little use in consulting them. Until within about twenty-five years the fat people, if we may use the expression, lay down under their fat. The opinion that fatness was irremediable was, in fact, widely diffused. Mrs. Fanny Kemble used to say, in her grand manner, that "when there was a constitutional tendency to fat, nor diet, nor exercise, nor sorrow would avail."

Since she took this view, however, a great change has come over what we may call the fat world. Fat people refuse any longer to accept their fatness as hopeless. They deny that any portion of the human family has been set apart by Nature as the prey of obesity. This great awakening was due in a large degree to the celebrated Banting, an immensely fat man, who, by greatly reducing his weight by confining himself to nitrogenous food, filled all fat people with the anticipation of a better day. Tens of thousands followed his example, and cut down their size immensely. Unfortunately he died very soon after he became lean, and a panic spread through his followers. Distrust about the effect of his system on the general health began to gain ground. Many people suffered severely in strength and spirits by following his regimen too strictly, and it fell into more or less discredit. It would now be as hard to find an original out-and-out disciple of Banting as of Priessnitz, the hydropathist, or of Hahnemann, the homoeopathist. But many still follow him in a slight degree, by eschewing butter, eating but little bread and potatoes, and sticking steadily to lean meat.

If his teachings and example had had no effect at all, however, it would have proved that the fat people were less enterprising and energetic than other civilized men in our day ever are. They refused to consider Banting's failure as final. They declined to accept the doctor's advice to "let well alone." They continued their demand that obesity should be treated as a disease, and a cure found for it. Accordingly, every few years a new fat doctor appears on the scene, and the quacks fill up the intervals with the sale of more or less deadly specifics. No great progress was made, however, until Bismarck became dissatisfied with his fat, and called for a physician who could relieve him of it. This physician appeared in the person of a certain Dr. Schweninger, who cut down the Chancellor's weight to such an extent that he had him nominat-

ed to a professorship in the Faculty of Medicine in the Berlin University, and insisted on his appointment in the teeth of the opposition of the other doctors, who had either never heard of Schweninger before, or heard what was bad. To the argument that he had won no distinction in the profession, the answer was that he had taken fifty or sixty pounds off the Prince's huge frame. Schweninger accordingly rapidly became an authority on fatness, and the pamphlet containing his system is sold by tens of thousands.

The well-known Dr. Yeo of London discusses this system in the last number of the *Nineteenth Century*. It ought to be said *en passant* that Schweninger's cure is claimed also by Prof. Oertel of Munich, who says he discovered it, but this avails him little because he did not treat the Chancellor. Schweninger maintains that the chief cause of fat among men, as among animals, is eating too much, no matter of what, and drinking too much, even of water, at one's meals, but especially of wine, beer, and spirits. The central principle of his system is, that unless you live by muscular toil, you must cut down the quantity you eat, and must drink but little, if any, with your meals. Of course he has minor rules, and makes distinctions between different articles of food, but to him quantity is the great enemy of the obese. After him comes a certain Ebstein, who also has his system, which differs from both Banting's and Schweninger's, but all three agree that to belean you must greatly reduce your consumption of the carbo-hydrates or starchy things.

Germany is the country where the most vigorous fight with fat is carried on, and where fat cures excite most interest, owing, it is said, to the great prevalence of obesity—a result in part of the consumption of beer and in part, doubtless, of the frequency and heartiness of the meals. Accordingly, the number of people who go to the various baths for simple corpulency is very large. Oertel makes provision for this class by prescribing carefully graded walks, in which the ascent will stimulate the heart's action and strengthen it.

All the masters agree that it is mainly through its effect on the heart that fat becomes dangerous. If you surround your heart thickly with fat, you impede its working, and it gradually grows weaker, and then, some fine day, when you have put a little more fat on it, and call on it for extra exertion, it stops short, and down you go. Fat does not greatly trouble the young and active in any country. It is when, in middle life, exercise begins to be distasteful but the appetite remains as good as ever, that it comes on people like a strong man armed, and makes exertion, especially in hot weather, very formidable. But the fat people are aroused, and we feel sure their number, in proportion to population, will hereafter be diminished.

THE SLATER MEMORIAL MUSEUM.

PERSONS visiting the beautiful city of Norwich a few months hence will find there a museum of fine art of a kind which every big

town or little city might possess, given only sufficient knowledge and good taste. These, indeed, it must set itself to seek in earnest. If it can command the most extensive knowledge and the most delicate refinement of feeling in the person of the custodian, the chairman, the president, the director, or whoever else the official may be who has charge of selection and purchase, a wonderful collection can be procured with small outlay. There is excellent art which can be reproduced so well that, while something is lost, very much remains. To select from out the mass of the world's possession of such art as this the few pieces which the fund allows—choosing those which are the most instructive, as being either the most nearly uninjured, or as being the most perfect types of important schools or epochs, or even as being more easily comprehensible by intelligent but not especially trained minds—is, of course, a task for which few students are fitted. Years of residence in those parts of the world where works of art can be studied comparatively and critically, and a minute and exclusive devotion to such study and comparison, are the necessary preliminary to the proper expenditure of even a few thousand dollars in the foundation of a really instructive museum of fine art. Given these qualifications in some one whose services you can command, and it is astonishing how much great and precious art a few thousand dollars will buy, and how admirable a museum a citizen of moderate means may present to his native town. Much more may be expected when the citizen is possessed of ample means and the most liberal disposition, as in the case in hand. Mr. W. A. Slater has been the good genius to bestow this boon upon the city of Norwich, and Mr. Edward Robinson, of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, has, to his great credit, had sole charge of the selection and arrangement.

That part of the Slater Memorial Building which is devoted to the Museum of Fine Art is a large hall, reaching to the roof, and having a broad gallery next the wall on each of the four sides. There are windows below the gallery and windows above the gallery on three sides, and dormers in the roof on two sides. There is abundant light; and in the central area within the belt of galleries the light is good for sculpture, as it is, in the main, in the galleries themselves. Under the galleries the windows are too low, as indeed the ceiling is, for large pieces of sculpture, which nevertheless it has been found necessary to place there. A life-size or "heroic" statue needs a very diffused light; the necessity of putting many such statues in the strong horizontal and concentrated light from windows near the sculpture and on its own level is to be regretted. This same light does well for bas-reliefs, however, and it is to be hoped that when all the sculpture is in hand, it will be found possible to occupy nearly all the space beneath the galleries with sculpture in relief, including medallions, coins, and the like, to the exclusion of, at least, the larger statues and groups. This space beneath the galleries is to be divided into alcoves by means of curtains hung from rods, and capable of being drawn at will. The arrangement of the sculptures now going on seems to include a mainly chronological sequence, which is eminently desirable, but which may involve of necessity the inadequate lighting of which mention has been made. Thus the Harmodios and Aristogeiton group from Naples is fortunate in being placed in the high central nave, but the Naples Doryphoros suffers from the direct and concentrated light which alone it receives in its alcove. On the other hand, the Calf-Bearer from Athens

and the Spinario from the Capitol, being smaller, are sufficiently well lighted, and the early reliefs are in an excellent light—the great Eleusis relief being more perfectly placed and illuminated, for all purposes of examination and study, than any copy of this important and puzzling work of art that we can now recall in Europe.

There are now about one hundred and fifty important classical sculptures in place, and more are to come. Among these are some of the newest discoveries, such as the Boxer that has recently come to light in Rome. Of the archaic works, and of those just not archaic, but still full of the breath of early art, a few have been named; there are also the so-called Apollo of Tenea and the Aristokles relief from Athens, the headless robed figure from the Louvre, and four-figures of the west pediment of Ægina from Munich; also, one of the Selinus metopes from Palermo, and a large part of the frieze of Phigalia. Then, of perfected art, there are nearly 140 feet of the Parthenon frieze, and from the Parthenon pediment, the Theseus and two of the groups of draped figures; with other works that we cannot enumerate. All that is well preserved of the parapet of Nike-Apteros; the noble Hermes of Andros, and, to compare with this, its double from the Vatican Belvedere; one of the Discobolus statues, and, to compare with this, a small-scale reproduction of another and differing one; a vast slab from the Pergamon frieze of the Giants' Battle, the Laocoon, the Venus of Milo, the draped Niobide from the Vatican, the Nike of Paionios (shown here, as nowhere else in the world, on an exact reproduction of its original pedestal), and a pedestal reserved for the torso of the Belvedere whose coming is announced—the mention of these must suffice to give an idea of the whole collection; to which, as representative of Greek and Greco-Roman art, no exception can be taken. It does not appear that it would be possible to choose better the same number of pieces as representative of the whole mass of such sculpture which is known to us moderns. If any piece not included were proposed, on condition of excluding one of the present collection to make room for it, it would be seen that such a change would be of at least doubtful expediency.

The sculpture of the later Middle Ages and of the Renaissance is less easy to embody in a couple of hundred examples taken from its vast stores. It cannot be hoped that any two students of art would agree heartily on the selection to be made. Moreover, there are at Norwich fewer in proportion of the Renaissance pieces already in place, and the future of the museum of modern art is much less easy to judge of than of the classical department. What is good about it, what is hopeful and promising, is the large freedom with which semi-architectural pieces, such as the pulpit of S. Croce, the large font of Siena, and the tomb of the Cardinal della Rovere, and pieces of pure decoration—sword handles, bells, weapons, and the like—admirably reproduced by Josef Kretzmayer of Munich, colored and gilded or bronzed into actual facsimile of the original, are added to the statuary and reliefs. The statue of Lorenzo de' Medici, with the accompanying supporters, "Twilight" and "Dawn," are set above a door the architectural frame of which seems well calculated to receive them; but they are placed too high to be properly seen from the gallery itself, and unfortunately they can be seen also from the floor below. It is greatly to be desired that they could be arranged more as the originals in the Sacristy of San Lorenzo. The same might be said of Michael Angelo's Moses, but that its placing is possibly only tem-

porary. Panels from the doors of the Florence Baptistery—the earlier doors, those of the northern and southern portals—and from the Donatello Altar in Saint Antony's Church at Padua, give one the hope that these works may be shown ultimately in their completeness. The panels from Luca della Robbia's Singing Gallery are, one is sorry to see, already framed into the wall, so that this important work will not be put up with its architectural framework complete; but one cannot have everything. There is no room for such a mass of construction; one might as well insist upon all the Della Robbia reliefs of swaddled babies from the Hospital of the Innocents instead of rejoicing over the two that are already here. The whole collection of casts promises to be excellent and instructive beyond the reach of fault-finding. All have been chosen with extreme care, and if the student is left wishing that bronze originals should be represented by a bronze-colored rather than by a white reproduction, and that painted sculpture should be reproduced in full color, this is only what he feels on leaving any of the important collections of Europe, beginning with the vast and, for classic sculpture, almost complete collection at Berlin.

Coinage is to be studied in air-tight and dust-tight glazed frames, behind the plate glass of which, and mounted on dark velvety material, the deceptively imitative reproductions are mounted. Each coin is shown, the obverse and the reverse side by side, and an inscription immediately below gives the approximate date and the city or kingdom.

A few photographs are framed and glazed, ready to be exposed. They are the largest, and partly because of this the most effective with the spectator, that could be chosen. Thus, the enormous view of the west front of Reims Cathedral, made by J. Trompette of Reims, is a type of what an architectural photograph for public exhibition ought to be. The Naya photograph of the front of Saint Mark's is almost equally imposing. One of the largest frames is Braun's ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, but this photograph is made up of many pieces. Here is also the Sistine Madonna, a single plate half the size of the original, and the great Paul Veronese of the Venice Academy, known as the "Green Man," from the supposed portrait of the artist—a noble full-length figure, invested in various shades of that color, who stands fully relieved against a prominent mass of the architecture. This large photograph is also in three pieces; but several of the ceiling panels of the great rooms of the Ducal Palace, though nearly as large, are each a single print, and one of the finest photographs in the collection is Braun's superb new plate of the "Night Watch."

Into further detail we cannot go. It has seemed important to mention by name some of the works of art of admittedly supreme merit, which are capable of such reproduction that those who are far from the originals may yet gain much of that enjoyment which they can give. Casts of sculpture may be made almost perfect reproductions of the originals; electro-types of coins may be absolutely perfect reproductions—that is to say, the first living experts are sometimes in doubt whether a coin offered them is genuine or not. Photographs, we know, give often more than one would expect, so to speak; the photograph, even of a painting, though reversing many of the comparative lights and darks of the original, gives yet a sense of that original's beauty which no engraver's copy has succeeded in doing. Engravings themselves, ancient and modern, made with the burin or with the etching needle and

acid, and woodcuts as well, are capable of indefinite and very cheap reproduction by modern processes; any one may have Amand-Durand copies of Dürer and Rembrandt prints, which, if not equal to the choicest impressions from the original plates, are better than impressions which are considered passable and salable. Drawings by the old masters have been admirably copied, as every one knows, in autotype; the only defect of the copies being that every accidental pen scratch, stain, or finger-mark is of necessity reproduced in the tint of the drawing itself. Color you cannot reproduce, nor texture of surface; a Japanese lacquer, a Chinese porcelain, an embroidered cope or chasuble, you cannot reproduce, and of paintings you can give only the abstract in monochrome. This limit is set to our low-priced museum; but of the world of noble art which is included within this limit, the Slater Museum at Norwich gives an inspiring and encouraging realization.

THE TWO EMPERORS AT ST. PETERSBURG.

PARIS, July 28, 1888.

THE eyes of all Europe may be said to be turned at present on the shores of the Neva; but, alas! we cannot say with Voltaire:

"C'est du Nord aujourd'hui que nous vient la lumière."

We are left in utter darkness as to the results of the interview of the two Emperors of the North. We know the most minute details of their meeting, the correspondents of the English, German, and French newspapers tell us all that is visible to the eye; but we can find few significant details in the immense amount of their information. We know, however, that there is something remarkable, something important, in the character of the first political steps taken by the young Emperor of Germany, who has been called to the throne by the lamentable death of Frederick III. In his first declaration to the Reichstag, William II. spoke of his allies, Austria and Italy; he did not even pronounce the name of France, or, what may appear more singular, of England. But he reminded his people that Prussia had old ties of friendship with Russia, and he showed himself inclined to follow the policy of his predecessors with regard to the great Empire of the North.

This was not enough—he did not wait for the effects of this declaration. He started for Saint Petersburg as if he were determined to conquer the confidence and the good will of his powerful neighbor. In order to well understand the importance of this visit, you must remember the violence of the attacks of the Russian press on Germany and of the German press on Russia during the last months of the reign of William I. The antipathy of the Slavs and of the German races had free play for a time; war seemed almost imminent; the German official press complained every day of the warlike disposition of Russia, of the great movement of troops on the Polish frontiers and in Poland; it seemed as if immense masses of cavalry were all ready to enter into Posen and Silesia, and to hinder the mobilization in the German frontier provinces.

When William died, the accession of his already dying son put a stop to this polemical war. The Pan Slavist organs became silent; by a sort of tacit understanding the press of Russia as well as the press of Germany did not trouble the slow agony of a sovereign who was known to be inspired with generous sentiments, and whose last thoughts tended only to the peace of the world. It was to be feared, however, that this peace, imposed by the state of

the sovereign, was only a truce, and that hostilities would break out again after his death, especially as the new sovereign was represented as an ambitious young man, ardent for action and for glorious deeds. The new Emperor, fortunately, had always professed the most fervid admiration for the Chancellor of the Empire, and everybody felt that, especially at the beginning of his reign, he would be ready to accept the advice and to follow the policy of Prince Bismarck. His visit to Saint Petersburg derives all the more importance from this consideration, since it may be considered as the joint inspiration of the Emperor and of his Chancellor.

To those who know the history of Prussia as well as the history of Prince Bismarck, the initiative taken by the Emperor will not be a matter of surprise. Read the history of the Electors of Brandenburg, and afterwards of the kingdom of Prussia, and you will see that Prussia has never obtained any marked political advantage, that she has never entered on any great enterprise, without having assured herself, if not of the coöperation, at least of the neutrality, of Russia; and when this coöperation or neutrality has failed her, she has suffered great reverses of fortune. To speak only of the more recent events—at the time of the last Polish insurrection, Prince Bismarck concluded with Prince Gortchakoff a military convention (February 8, 1863), and he was soon afterwards paid for this service: the question of the Danish duchies arose, and the alliance of Prussia and of Russia allowed Prince Bismarck to give it a solution which was favorable to his country. "The Vice-Chancellor," wrote Lord Napier to his Government at the beginning of the Danish difficulty, "is disposed to consider a federal execution as a conservative measure." Russia abandoned the cause of Denmark, though it had, more than any Power in Europe, the greatest interest in the liberty of the Baltic. When war broke out between Prussia and Austria, Russia remained perfectly neutral; the Cabinet of Saint Petersburg felt or affected the most perfect security. Russia seemed totally unconcerned—in reality she enjoyed the discomfiture of Austria.

At the time of the war between France and Prussia, Russia preserved the same attitude. The prodigious victories of the Emperor William excited no alarm in St. Petersburg. If you read a book published by Schneider, who accompanied the Emperor William in the Austrian and French campaigns, you will find abundant proofs of the sympathy felt by the Emperor of Russia for his uncle; he is never tired of expressing his admiration for his deeds. The mutual understanding between Russia and Prussia at the time of the Franco-German war became apparent to all the world when Russia denounced the clause of the Treaty of Paris which restricted its liberty of action in the Black Sea. Everybody understood that the virtual abolition of the treaty made after the fall of Sebastopol was the price of Russian neutrality. After Sadowa, Napoleon III. had pronounced "Vae victis!" on Austria; after Sedan, the Emperor of Russia pronounced "Vae victis!" on France.

On February 26, 1871, the Emperor of Germany telegraphed from Versailles to the Emperor of Russia: "It is with an inexpressible feeling, and with thanks to God, that I announce to you that the preliminaries of peace have been signed. Never will Prussia forget that she owes to you the fact that the war has not taken on extreme proportions. May God bless you! Your friend, grateful for life."

Many things have happened since; and after the Turkish war, Russia found fault with Prus-

sian gratitude. The Treaty of Berlin left her discontented with herself, and discontented with her neighbors. This vague feeling of ill-humor has been much worked upon by the Pan-Slavists, as well as by the Revolutionists, by all those, in fact, who form the party of opposition—a party which in Russia has no organization, no regular organs, but which is nevertheless important, and perhaps all the more dangerous for being unorganized. Things went so far that Prince Bismarck, when he asked the Reichstag not long ago to vote new credits for the army and to alter the military laws, had to face the possibility of a struggle which might oblige Germany to confront her enemies on her eastern as well as on her western frontier. Still, in this bold and extraordinary speech, the Chancellor was very careful not to say a word which might give offence to the Emperor of Russia; he made the strongest appeal to the personal sentiments of the sovereign, and it may be supposed that the new Emperor of Germany, in his visit to St. Petersburg, will hold a similar language—that he will show to the Emperor a real danger in the effervescence of the Pan-Slavist and anti-German passions. The two Emperors are both strong enough to control the unreasoning passions of the multitude; they both feel that a great responsibility arises from the extent of their own power; they have both, however, to deal with great difficulties. Prussia is no longer the Prussia of old. Since obtaining the long-coveted hegemony of Germany, not under the form which would have satisfied her, but under the form of the Empire, she has new duties, she has also new interests. Since Sadowa, she detains in what the diplomats call her sphere of influence the large part of Germany which was for a long time in Austria's sphere of influence, and which afterwards oscillated for many years between Berlin and Vienna. Since the war of 1870 and the erection of the new empire, the influence of Prussia extends over all the German-speaking provinces of the centre of Europe, over Gross-Deutschland, and may be said to extend also indirectly over all the provinces which are bound by old historical ties to the Austrian Empire. The creation of German unity, which had been prepared by so many thinkers, but which was only accomplished in our time, has altered the historical mission of Prussia.

The new Empire cannot have exactly the same position with regard to Russia as the Prussia of the great Frederick. Prussia is no longer struggling for life, to borrow an expression from the Darwinian theory; she has no longer to think only of her frontier, of her organization; she has become essentially the representative of German culture—she represents a stage and a form of civilization highly different in every respect from the rudimentary civilization of Russia. What do we see in Russia? The Slavic orthodoxy, intolerant, propagandist, which does not separate the ambitions of the State and the ambitions of the Church. What do we see in Germany? A diversity of religious communions, the Occidental ideal of the state which allows to the religious conscience whatever is not contrary to public order. In the political order of ideas, the contrast is quite as great. Russia professes as a dogma the theory of the omnipotent Emperor, the autocrat, only judge and only master, sovereign in the most absolute sense of the word, unfettered by chambers and by constitutional rules. In Germany we see a powerful Emperor, but we see Chambers, and the sovereign does not ascend the throne without swearing to respect the Constitution. Nobody has ever spoken with more force than Prince Bismarck against the abuse of Parliamentarism, but who

has made more frequent and eloquent appeals to public opinion? Who has better felt the necessity of speaking to the people, of being understood by the people? We need not follow our comparison any further, in all the details of the social organization; it is enough to say that Germany is conscious of representing a civilization and a culture which are very different from the Russian, and, therefore, it is not to be wondered at if a close alliance between the two German empires has become the necessary basis of her policy.

As we have shown Prussia in her double aspect of Prussia proper and of Prussia representative of the German interest, we might show the Russian Government in double form and character. The dynasty is German in origin, bound by a hundred ties to the Occidental princely families. A German element is found in all the higher spheres of the administration and of the army; Germany gave the first lineaments of civilization to Russia. But under what might be called the German envelope is a great people, with sentiments, habits of thought, passions, aspirations, entirely unknown to the Occident, even adverse to the Occident. The Government of Russia is like a medal with two faces. Its mission is difficult, for it has to reconcile constantly its policy with the feelings of the great Slavia or Panslavia. At the present moment Russia feels that she has suffered a great moral defeat in Bulgaria; she considers this province as a necessary part of Panslavia, which has been torn from it by the wicked diplomacy of Europe and the astuteness of Prince Bismarck. *Inde iræ.* It is difficult to see how the interests of general peace can long be harmonized with the growing ambition of the Pan-Slavists; and the future is all the more uncertain because the passions of the Slavic world have no organized representation, because the authority of the Emperor is more arbitrary.

THE FRITZ REUTER CELEBRATION AT JENA.

JENA, July 22, 1888.

THE site of the old walls and moat of Jena is now occupied by four streets, which encircle the old town and are still called the *Graben*. That on the north, Fürsten-Graben, has been converted into a promenade. On it are the old Schloss, the University building, the Library, and the Botanical Garden, with the house once occupied by Goethe. Between the trees on the other side of the drive are shrubs and flower-beds and the mounted busts of former Jena professors. Among these, opposite my window, have stood since the sad 14th of June the scaffolding and the pedestal of the unfinished Reuter monument—a fit emblem of the rent the death of Emperor Frederick made in the hearts of the German people.

A few days ago the work was again taken up and the colossal bust mounted. The celebration began with a grand *Kommers* in which the Korps and Burschenschaften as well as the scientific and other societies took part. They appeared "*wichs*"—in other words, they wore their society caps, and their officers had decked themselves out in their handsome regalia, including their swords, with the flat blades of which, at the close of each stanza of the songs, they sang, they belabored the beer-tables in wild old barbarian style. There were several short speeches, some in High, some in Low German. The principal speeches of the evening considered the *Kommers*, next to the ceremony of unveiling the bust, the most important part of the celebration; "for in the case of a man so thoroughly German as Fritz Reuter, a celebra-

tion must be German, and to drink beer—to drink great quantities of beer—is German”—which was received with a round of applause. As is usual on such occasions, the drinking and singing lasted on towards morning, and the police were instructed to keep out of the way and not see anything as the revellers made their way home.

A finer day for a celebration than yesterday could not have been desired. It was Sunday, and soon after the morning service the various societies began to collect before the old college buildings. At the head of each society, gathered about its richly embroidered banner, were its officers, wearing their beautiful velvet caps with waving plumes, their gaudy sashes, hip-boots, and swords. This semester the Finken, or Independents, for the first time also appeared *wichs*, the Finkenkönig on their head. They carry the University flag. On its way to Fürsten-Graben, the procession, headed by the Mayor of Jena and the Parliamentary representative, passed through various streets of the quaint old University town. The population seemed to take a hearty interest in the celebration, and from nearly every window hung a flag displaying the colors of one or another of the societies or those of the town, the Grand Duchy, or the Empire.

The address was delivered by Dr. Ernst Harmening, an attorney in Jena, but by birth a Plattdeutscher. He began with a quotation from a letter from Frau Louise Reuter: "In Mecklenburg stood his cradle, in Thuringian soil rest his remains—the beginning and the end. Between these—Jena." It was these words which, when the question arose as to where a monument should be erected to Reuter's memory, led to the selection of Jena. "In Mecklenburg stood his cradle": in the little town of Stavenhagen, November 7, 1810, Fritz Reuter was born, the child of the town justice and burgo-master, who at the same time managed a large farm. Of the "Stembäger" life of these early years, Reuter has given us a charming picture in "Schurr Murr." At the age of fourteen he was put to school at Friedland and later at Parchim. His university studies were begun at Rostock; and at Easter, 1832, we find him matriculating at Jena. The Burschenschaften were just then at the height of their political development, and Reuter plunged headlong into their wild life. It was intended that he should study law, but he had little taste for it, and devoted what time he could spare from fencing and "beer studies" to mathematics and drawing. How dear to him in after years the memory of his life in Jena was, we can judge by the scene in 'Hanne Nüte' where the good pastor for the time forgets that "Die ganze Kreatur ist in der Sünde tief versunken" and "Es ist auf Erden alles eitel," and passionately bursts out with:

"Steh' mich, mein Sohn! In meinen alten Tagen
Lebt frisch noch die Erinnerung,
Als ich, wie du, einst frei und jung,
Den Flug that in die Ferne wagen.
Ach Jena! Jena! Lieber Sohn,
Sag' mal, hörst du von Jena schon?
Hast du von Jena mal geles'n?
Ich bin ein Jahr darin gewesen,
Als ich noch Studiosus war;
Was war das für ein schönes Jahr!"

At the end of the year Reuter returned home, and in the fall, while on a visit in Berlin, was arrested by the Prussian authorities as a member of the Burschenschaft, and confined, during a three years' investigation of his case, in various fortresses. He was then condemned to death for "attempted treason," but the sentence was changed by William III. to one of thirty years' imprisonment. He was confined successively at Silberberg, Glogau, Magdeburg, and Graudenz, being obliged to endure unusually hard treatment. At the end of seven years

the Mecklenburg Government succeeded in getting its subject back into its own hands, but only on condition that he should continue to serve out his sentence in his native land until the Prussian King should be pleased to pardon him. But here he did not lack manifestations of kindness and regard, and at the death of King William he was set at liberty by the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg. Much as he had been compelled to suffer, it does not seem to have embittered him in the least, and we can hardly overestimate the qualities of heart and mind which did not permit these years of hardship and abuse to develop in Reuter the bitter satirist rather than the genial humorist.

On regaining his liberty, he once more took up the study of the law, and this time at Heidelberg; but he soon let it drop again and became a "Strom," as they call a farmer in Mecklenburg. At his father's death in 1845 there were, however, no means at hand to undertake the management of a farm, and Reuter's next five years were spent in an irregular, wandering life. Having engaged himself to Louise Kunze, the daughter of a pastor, he settled down to the occupation of private tutor, and in his spare time wrote poems in his native dialect. The unexpected success of his first volume, 'Läuschen un Riemels,' led him to devote himself entirely to dialect writing. This instantaneous success was doubtless not a little due to the interest that Groth's 'Quickborn,' which had appeared the year before, had aroused for the hitherto neglected dialect. Plattdeutsch had become the fashion, and this fashion prepared the way for a just appreciation of the genius of the man who had chosen that idiom for its expression. In 1856 Reuter moved to Neubrandenburg, where he lived till 1863. These years were those of his greatest literary activity—'Olle Kamellen,' 'Schurr Murr,' 'Hanne Nüte,' 'Kein Hüsung'; and nothing that he afterwards wrote added to the reputation these had won for him. But for a trip to Palestine and Greece in 1864, the last ten years of his life were spent in the handsome villa which one passes on his way from Eisenach up to the Wartburg—years the memory of which is saddened by the knowledge that they were the last steps a great man was taking to a drunkard's grave. In a country where even the religiously bigoted cannot withhold from the liberal author of 'Hanne Nüte' and 'Olle Kamellen' their admiration and affection, there can be no lack of apologists for a man who could not control his appetite for drink, and the blame is thrown now upon hereditary tendencies, now upon the peculiar circumstances of his prison life, less often upon the temptations of his student days.

The unveiling of the bust was followed by brief addresses from the delegates from the various Plattdeutsche Vereine, who laid garlands at the foot of the pedestal. At two there was a banquet at the sign of the Black Bear (memorable as the inn at which Luther was wont to stop, and the scene of his interview with the Swiss student Kessler and of his heated controversy with Karlstadt). The bill of fare was printed in Low German and began with:

"Wat dat all to eten giwt
to dat
Festeten be de Enthüllung
von dat
Reuter Denkmal."

And how is this as a sample of successful avoidance of the hated *Fremdwort*?—"Kalv-fleesch in'ne fine klüterige Stipp in Bläderdeeg inleggt up de Aart as de Franzosen dat in Toulouse eten. (dor nennen's dat Fricassée)?" Besides the members of the Plattdeutsche Vereine and the guests from abroad, many

citizens and students were present, but not more than one or two of the University professors. Telegrams of greeting were received from Frau Reuter, the Grand Duke, and many others. No little credit is due the Burschenschaften in Jena for their substantial contribution to the monument fund. Other contributors were not forgotten, and I was glad to hear the hearty and repeated expressions of appreciation of what had been done by those in America who had taken an interest in the matter. The bust is considered by those who knew the author ("Olle Peters" himself was present) a good likeness of Reuter as he appeared in his best years. A representation of it will be found in the *Illustrierte Zeitung* for July 21. Ernst Paul, the sculptor, was born in Arolsen in the Duchy of Waldeck in 1856. As a pupil of Schilling he was engaged upon the National Monument on the Niederwald, and, besides minor works, has produced the Gutenberg statue in the Germanic Museum at Nürnberg and a "Sandalenbinderin" that is praised.

Some of the guests returned to their homes by the evening trains, but not a few remained over till to-day, and enjoyed one or more of the delightful walks and climbs of which the valleys and the hills about Jena offer such a profusion—drank Lichtenhainer where it is brewed, and bought a Ziegenhainer cane where they grow—or joined in ascending the Hausberg and drank a *Frühschoppen* at the Fuchsturm. But the real close of the celebration was yesterday evening, when many of us climbed up to the Sophienhöhe, a place of amusement on the slope of the Kernberge southeast of Jena, and, seated about the little tables in the gardens or on the verandas and gallery of the inn, spent a pleasant hour or so in that simple and *gemütlich* way the Germans so well understand. At our feet lay spread out the valley of the Saale with Jena and the neighboring villages. On the elevated plateau to the northwest the mighty invader dealt Prussia his hardest blow—on the heights opposite rises above the Jenaer Forst the imposing tower erected in commemoration of the final victory over the *Erbfeind*. As the sun went down behind the Thuringian hills we sang Reuter's "Ik weit einen Eikbom," and that song, so dear to the hearts of all who have had the good fortune to spend a summer in Jena, "An der Saale hellem Strande."

GEORGE HEMPLE.

Correspondence.

THE FIRST COLLEGE OBSERVATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Professor Loomis states, in his 'Progress of Astronomy' (edition of 1850, p. 162), that the first attempt to establish a college observatory in the United States was made by Prof. Albert Hopkins of Williams College, Massachusetts. This is an error; and it is repeated in the *Nation* of July 12, 1888, in the introduction to your abstract of Professor Safford's address on "Fifty Years of American Astronomy." Your article states that the Williams College Observatory was erected in 1838. Seven years before, an "attempt" had been made at the University of North Carolina by Dr. Joseph Caldwell, who was then President, and had been for a long time Professor of Mathematics. This was probably the first attempt made in this country, and will you not allow me space for a brief account of it?

In 1824 Dr. Caldwell was sent to Europe to buy books and apparatus for the University. Among the instruments he purchased in Lon-

don were a meridian transit instrument and a zenith telescope made by Simms, a refracting telescope by Dollond, an astronomical clock by Molyneux, a sextant by Wilkinson, a reflecting circle by Harris, and a Hadley's quadrant. These instruments were used in the University buildings until 1831, when they were placed in an observatory which had just been built for them. This building was of brick and stone, about twenty feet square and twenty-five feet high. A column of masonry rose through the centre to furnish stable foundations for the instruments. The flat roof contained a wide slit which continued for some distance down the walls and afforded a range of 180° for the transit. This slit was covered by a wooden framework which could be moved by rope and windlass.

Observations were made at this place by President Caldwell, Prof. Elisha Mitchell, and Prof. James Phillips. But the observations were continued only a few years. The construction of the building was very imperfect. The flat roof was so troublesome that the instruments were removed soon after Dr. Caldwell's death in 1835, and the building was partially destroyed by fire in 1838. It was never restored. President Swain, who succeeded Caldwell, afterwards carried away the bricks and used them in building a kitchen. This is still in use! The ruins of the observatory are yet plainly visible on a hill just outside the campus.

The records of these observations have, in some way, been lost, whether during "Reconstruction days," when the University was closed for several years and troops quartered in the buildings, or before, no one seems to know.

Dr. Caldwell's attempt to establish this observatory deserves record. His instruments were small, but the equipment was entirely sufficient for an excellent beginning. Accurate and valuable work could have been done with it. There would have been something lasting done, and this might have grown into one of the best college observatories in the country, if Dr. Caldwell's successors had possessed his zeal and taste for astronomy. But the University was poor, the public was indifferent, and there was too much to struggle against—the opportunity was lost.

There are persons now living in Chapel Hill, whose authority is unquestioned, who were often in this observatory and saw the instruments in place. Among them is Rev. Dr. Charles Phillips, who, as a child, frequently attended his father, Dr. James Phillips, while making observations, and to whom I am indebted for the above facts.

During the civil war a novel use was found for the telescope, when some of Sherman's troops passed through Chapel Hill. The instrument had been lying unused for a number of years, on an upper shelf in one of the lecture-rooms, and looked harmless enough not to attract anybody's attention. Two of the professors thought it would be a good place to hide their watches. The dusty object-glass was removed and the watches carefully concealed within the tube. But some of the soldiers must have been enthusiasts in astronomy. At any rate they loved gold watches, and the unlucky professors had to apply to the officers of the regiment to have their watches returned!

JAMES L. LOVE,
Associate Professor of Mathematics.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, August 6, 1888.

WHAT THE REPUBLICANS EXPECT TO DO FOR CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: During the past year many of those who voted for the Democratic candidates in 1884 have beyond question been pained at President Cleveland's lapse from the civil-service principles to which he once gave utterance. Some of those who supported him at that time, forgetting now that with all his shortcomings in that regard there has not been another administration for a quarter of a century when the civil service of the country was, as a whole, so far removed from politics, appear to have despaired, and are considering whether it may not be wise to support the Republican nominees at the coming election, in the hope of better things from them, if elected.

On this point we may for the moment ignore the probability, now openly asserted by the Republican organs, that the election of Mr. Harrison means Mr. Blaine as Secretary of State and chief adviser, and four years of Blaineism abroad in the land. The Republican State Convention of Michigan, just held, has, we may assume unintentionally, but plainly, announced what may be expected in the civil service if the Republicans are successful in the present campaign. The platform adopted yesterday at Detroit "arraigns the Democratic party . . . for the prostitution of the civil service"—why? Because it is wrong in principle? No: simply because this "prostitution" has been found "so soon following the glowing declaration of the newly elected Democratic President"! The platform is silent as to the real views of the Republican party of Michigan on the naked question of civil-service management, but the speech of the temporary chairman, applauded to the echo by the Convention, formulates their sentiments better than any vote-catching plank in a platform. From the report in the *Detroit Tribune* (the Republican organ in Michigan) I make the following extract from the chairman's speech:

"I find no fault with the administration of the Democratic party in bestowing its favors and its offices upon its friends. That is one of the fundamental principles and tenets of my political faith [applause]; and I believe that in the early part of 1889 the Republican party will be kept very busy in that same direction [applause and laughter]."

Verily the spirit of the delegate from Texas still dwells in the Republican party. Does it promise better than President Cleveland's performances? G.

AUGUST 10, 1888.

CAMPAIGN CREDULOUSNESS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your editorial on "Campaign Lying" in the *Nation* of August 9, you state that "intelligent men are not fooled by them, and that they are meant for the ignorant workmen, particularly the Irish." In this you are mistaken, as I have talked to some men recently, whose intelligence is undoubted—notably a prominent member of Councils, representing one of the most influential wards in Philadelphia, who assured me that the article purporting to be an extract from the *London Times*, to the effect that "the only use England has for Irishmen now is to send them to the United States to vote for Cleveland and free trade," had positively appeared in the *London Times*, and gave me the date of its publication (June 16, I think). He also stated that in the future whenever this quotation was used, it was to have the date of publication. As far as I have observed, these articles are be-

lieved by intelligent Republicans as well as by the ignorant.—Yours, etc., W. H. C.

PHILADELPHIA, August 11, 1888.

"TO ADMIRE AT."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: At page 33 of your current volume, you designate the phrase "to admire at," in the sense of "to wonder at," as "a decided provincialism." Is it not, rather, an archaism? See Dr. Murray's Dictionary.

"To feel or express wonder mingled with approbation" is a sense of "to admire" which, I believe, has not hitherto been noticed by lexicographers.

"The Divine goodness, whose providence is never enough to be admired at."—William Watson, *A Decacordon of Ten Quodlibetical Questions* (ed. 1602), page 24.

The expressions "the onely admired at Heroes of the world in his dayes," "such admired at worthies," "his admired at holy father," and the like, occur in the same work, at A 2 v., pages 102, 145, and elsewhere.

As any one who has lived in New England must be aware, the meaning which the New Dictionary assigns to "I admire to do it," quoted from Miss Alcott, is erroneous. See Webster or Bartlett.—Your obedient servant,

F. H.

MARLESFORD, ENGLAND, July 23, 1888.

Notes.

WE mentioned last week the late Gen. Sheridan's aversion to any publication of his observations on the German Army in action during the war with France in 1870-71,—perhaps because what he did let slip touched German-American sensibilities somewhat deeply. The November *Scribner's*, it is now announced, will reproduce, in an article called "From Gravelotte to Sedan," the General's notes made during his stay at the German Headquarters. A high degree of interest will attach to this posthumous paper, as to the General's Memoirs, of which Charles L. Webster & Co. will be the publishers.

Harper & Bros. publish directly 'Fifty Years Ago,' by Walter Besant—an illustrated account of English life, customs, and manners at the date of Queen Victoria's accession.

Longmans, Green & Co. will shortly publish 'The Record of a Human Soul,' an anonymous little book, "the honest account of the struggle of a sceptic who ardently but unavailingly desired to believe."

A new edition of the late Capt. R. F. Coffin's 'Yachts and Yachting,' brought down to date by Charles E. Clay, editor of *Outing*, is in the press of Cassell & Co.

Mr. Edward McPherson's 'Handbook of Politics for 1888' will be issued by James J. Chapman, Washington, D. C., about September 1.

We welcome the appearance of a second edition of Mr. Edward Stanwood's 'History of Presidential Elections' (Boston: Ticknor & Co.), which also serves as a history of parties, in default of a general work on the latter subject. Apparently it is the intention of author and publishers to renew this work every four years, so that the political student may be kept fully abreast of the movement of the national sentiment. Armed with the present volume, and with McPherson's 'Handbook of Politics' (which lags this year-like our pokey Congress and our deliberate Presidential campaign), the stump-speaker and the voter have great resources for intelligent thought, speech, and

action. Mr. Stanwood's new chapters tell, first, the story of the campaign of 1884 with impartiality, and with an accuracy not to be questioned, unless we take issue with his positive ascription of the defeat of Blaine to the alliterative Dr. Burchard. The second one records with all necessary detail the passage of the Electoral Count Bill and the Presidential Succession Bill—two measures whose success in a time of strictly-drawn party lines and of public apathy on the matters in question, contains a most useful moral for the legislator and the reformer. Finally, an appendix embalms the party conventions and platforms of the current year, and the index crowns the whole.

The latest olive-green Bohn réissue to reach us is an edition of Goldsmith's plays, "The Good-Natured Man" and "She Stoops to Conquer" (Scribner & Welford).

From the Messrs. Longman we have a School Geography, by George G. Chisholm, who owns his large measure of indebtedness to a German model, and who has in turn furnished a model to our American makers of similar works. Its English origin and scope by no means deprive it of direct usefulness in our schools, at least as an adjunct. The illustrations, in which the fanciful is suppressed, are excellent. The same author and publisher produce a Junior Geography, more condensed, with a few diagrams and no scenic illustrations, but with uncolored maps reduced to their simplest terms.

A supplementary reading-book for schools, 'Familiar Animals and their Wild Kindred,' by John Monteith (Van Antwerp, Bragg & Co.), is noticeable for the pains taken to supply engravings of the several animals discoursed of. The result in this direction, if it falls considerably short of Bewick, is nevertheless much above the average. It is open to doubt whether for reading purposes it is not better for the teacher to have at command several first-rate naturalist books of travel.

Prof. George O. Curme, of Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa, edits for D. C. Heath & Co., Boston, Selected Poems from the 'Premières et Nouvelles Méditations' of Lamartine. Prof. Curme has the enthusiasm of an ardent admirer, and takes much satisfaction in reviewing the list of the poet's critics now forgotten. He furnishes a somewhat florid sketch of Lamartine's career, and adds notes chiefly explanatory and literary.

Ginn & Co., Boston, have brought out 'Aims and Methods in Classical Study,' by Prof. W. G. Hale of Cornell University, a companion pamphlet to his 'Art of Reading Latin.' It consists of an address delivered last year before the Massachusetts Classical and High School Teachers' Association in Boston, and is full of suggestion and instruction.

An obvious reflection arises when we are shown 'Charts of the Governments of the United States and of the State of Virginia,' displayed on one sheet for comparison by a school principal of Roanoke, Va., Mr. William M. Graybill. The idea is a good one, and is to be carried out for every State in the Union.

The second Bulletin of the Agricultural Experiment Station at Cornell University demonstrates the differences in value of the wool, flesh, and fat of lambs as fed on nitrogenous and non-nitrogenous food. Colored plates of several cuts from the slaughtered animals after photographs are very striking.

Mr. Horace Howard Furness comes to the defence (in *Shakespeareiana* for August) of a passage in the trial scene of the "Merchant of Venice"—

"Thy curriish spirit
Govern'd a wolf who hanged for human slaughter"—

which in his Variorum Edition he had intimated was corrupt. He cites the practice of hanging wolves and other rapacious animals for their sins. This custom, we will add, which seems opposed to modern notions, was nothing strange to a generation used to excommunications of noxious animals by the Catholic Church.

The principal articles in the twenty-third volume of the German Shakespeare Society's *Jahrbuch* are on "English Proverbs," by the late M. C. Wahl, a continuation and completion of an article on this subject printed in the last volume; and on "Timon of Athens," by Dr. W. Wendlandt. There is also a translation of Miss Grace Latham's paper on *Volumnia*, the mother of *Coriolanus* (according to Shakespeare), and an account by Th. Vatke of English feasts and meals in the Elizabethan era. A curious table of the representations of Shakespeare's plays on the German stage (including that at Milwaukee) during the year 1887 shows that twenty-five plays were given 717 times by 122 companies, "Othello" leading the list with 90 representations by 56 companies, "Hamlet" closely following with 88 times by 50 companies; the lowest being "The Tempest" and "As You Like It," each having been given twice by a single company. If, however, an adaptation of "Taming the Shrew" by Holbein, called "Liebe kann alles," be reckoned with the original play, this would stand first with 107 representations. The répertoire of the Meiningen Company included "The Merchant of Venice," "Julius Caesar," and "Twelfth Night," which they gave 48 times in different parts of Germany. There is no bibliography in this volume, but the completion of Prof. Burgersdijk's Dutch translation is noticed with the remark that "now Holland has this advantage over Germany, that she has all Shakespeare by one master-hand, while with us 'Meister' Schlegel translated but the smaller half."

The seventh annual report of the Dante Society, whose headquarters are at Cambridge, Mass., announces the approaching publication of Prof. E. A. Fay's 'Concordance of the Divina Commedia,' at the charge of a lady, one of the members of the Society. Mr. W. C. Lane has prepared the Dante bibliography for the year 1887, which is printed with the report, as was last year that for 1886. He intends at his leisure to bridge the gap between 1886 and the last contributions of Petzholdt. A prize has been awarded for a Dante essay by a student or recent graduate of Harvard, and fresh subjects are announced. The library has been steadily increased; but this, we regret to say, is not true of the Society's membership.

Feeble, numerically, as the Dante Society is, it has the distinction of being the fellow of the Deutsche Dante-Gesellschaft in an organized pursuit hitherto unknown even in Italy itself. This reproach has just been removed, thanks to the initiative of the Accademia della Crusca, with the support of the Marquis Pietro Torrigiani, Mayor of Florence, and with the approval of King Humbert, who enrolls himself in the new Società Danteica Italiana, as the Marquis says, "non come pallida ombra di sovrana protezione, ma come lucente vessillo di nazionalità." The Society, in fact, though it will have its seat at Florence, will have branches throughout the peninsula. We quote once more from the Mayor's circular for what he says of the Dante Society of Cambridge—words too generous for the present facts, but of good omen, we may trust: "Dallo spirito democratico della nazione giovane prende vigore ad espandersi."

The University Library at Copenhagen has just acquired a copy of the first book printed

in Icelandic, namely, the New Testament translated by Oddur Gottskálksson, and issued at Roeskilde, the old capital of Denmark, in 1540. The book exists in only a fragmentary state in Iceland, but the Copenhagen Royal Library has two very inferior copies. That which is now on the shelves of the University collection is absolutely perfect and in clean condition. It was found in the house of a Zealand peasant, not very far distant from Copenhagen, and was purchased for 25 Danish crowns (less than \$7)—its marketable value being, of course, a great many times that sum. Nothing is known of its history except that it was in Iceland down to near the year 1820.

There has recently been organized in Paris the "Société de l'Histoire de la Révolution Française." Its objects, as stated in the *Revue Historique*, are to cause a scientific method to be followed in the studies upon the French Revolution; to offer a rallying-point for all students of the history of this period; to publish inedited, rare, or original works touching that time; to organize historical lecture-courses; to prepare for the coming centennial celebration. Among the works announced for publication are the 'Mémoires inédits de Fournier l'Américain,' which will be edited by M. Aulard, the secretary of the new society.

Of late years, *Punch* has been to most Americans a mere picture-book, in which the "cuts" were of importance, and the "comic copy" seemed to be very inferior padding. But one series of articles which recently appeared, a "Manual for the Use of the Young Reciter," attracted attention far beyond that usually excited by the letter-press of the paper, and it was evident that the staff of *Punch* had received a new and valuable recruit. These articles have been reprinted in a neat little book with cover by Mr. Linley Sambourne, and we know now that "Burglar Bill" and his fellows are the work of "F. Anstey," as the author of 'Vice-Versa' still desires to be known. There are a baker's dozen of parodies in the thirteen different styles with which the amateur reciter or parlor elocutionist is wont to afflict unfortunate audiences. The subject of "Burglar Bill" (which is in the "Sympathetic Artless" style) is, oddly enough, almost identical with Mrs. Burnett's pathetic "Editha's Burglar." The "Wreck of the Steamship *Puffin*" is cruelly like the serious "marine emotional turgidities" which *Punch* publishes now and then. But perhaps the final poem, "Positively the Last Performance," is the most ludicrously exact exaggeration of all—its pseudo-pathos is most delightful.

Although the art of bookbinding is not in a very flourishing state in Great Britain, a monthly magazine devoted to the art has just completed the first year of its existence. The *Bookbinder* (London: Wm. Clowes & Son) is not a very attractive or a very artistic periodical; its editor's ideals are not high, his knowledge is not wide, and his editing is rather slovenly; but in the twelve numbers there are illustrations and scraps of information which those interested in bookbinding are glad to receive. There is an account of the exhibition of bookbindings by the Society of Arts last winter; also, an admirable and apparently exhaustive bibliography of bookbinding, to which we are able to add only the articles in the *Art Amateur*, the *Art Age*, and the *American Bookmaker*, and a chapter in the 'Home Library' of "Arthur Penn." It is to be wished that the editor of the *Bookbinder* would begin a systematic reproduction of the interesting and beautiful bindings exhibited in the King's Library at the British Museum, taking as his model M. Henri Bouchot's excellent book on

the bindings of the National Library in Paris. We glean that Mr. Weale is collecting material for a much needed history of bookbinding in England.

With the fourth annual report of the Commissioners of the State Reservation at Niagara for the past year, just issued at Albany, is printed a catalogue, by Mr. David F. Day, of the flowering and fern-like plants growing without cultivation in the vicinity of the falls of Niagara. Mr. Day's preliminary remarks on the connection between the flora and the geology of the neighborhood are very interesting. Goat Island he reports very rich in the number of its species, surpassing any adjacent area of equal size. The annual product, also, is noticeable for its abundance.

—The Drakes are disposed of in vol. xv of Leslie Stephen's 'Dictionary of National Biography' (Macmillan), and the great Admiral Sir Francis Drake has slightly more space accorded him than any other personage. Disraeli is a good second in this respect, and is treated in a manner that can give no offence to his admirers. In twelve pages the editor sums up what is needful to be said about Dickens. So far as the literary judgment goes, it is, on the whole, quite as high as one would have expected. Mr. Stephen says of the 'Pickwick Papers' that it "has caused more hearty and harmless laughter than any book in the language," and "shows in their highest development the qualities in which he [Dickens] most surpassed other writers." 'Martin Chuzzlewit' "shows Dickens at his highest power; . . . and the American scenes, revealing Dickens's real impressions, are perhaps the most surprising proof of his unequalled power of seizing characteristics at a glance." Of personal traits, Mr. Stephen observes slyly that Dickens "loved dogs, and had a fancy for keeping large and eventually savage mastiffs and St. Bernards; and he was kind even to contributors." His domestic infelicities are set down to his discredit. Good reading is the sketch of Charles Dibdin, and, in fact, of each of the Dibdins. Little is allowed by way of praise to the bibliophile Doctor, whose chief merit is detected in his share in founding the Roxburghe Club, precursor of the great number of similar publication societies. Another pioneer was C. W. Dilke, who established the practice of independent book reviewing. Dr. Thomas Dover, proverbially remembered in the name of Dover's powder, was also the discoverer of Alexander Selkirk, and thus was in a sense the author of 'Robinson Crusoe.' Sir Geo. Downing, with all his shortcomings, brought about specific appropriations for supplies in Parliamentary grants of money. He is, by his American birth, the most distinguished connecting link in this volume between the mother country and the United States. We could wish that room had been made, among the Dixons, for that Jeremiah whose surveying labors on the border of Maryland and Pennsylvania gave us the convenient politico-geographical expression "Mason and Dixon's line," to mark the parting of slave and free territory. For the same reason his chief, Charles Mason, merits recognition, perhaps, when overtaken in the Dictionary's alphabet. The writer of the sketch of Richard Doyle asserts that the facsimile of this artist's delightful MS. Journal of 1840 gives no idea of the beauty of the original in the British Museum. The inclusion of Alfred Domett, who died November 2, 1887—i. e., after the date when men were conventionally assumed to be living, and therefore to be excluded—has had several precedents, in the exercise of a wise discretion.

—The July *Bulletin Historique et Littéraire* contains the third part of a description by M. E. Delorme of the *méreau* or communion-token formerly in use in the French Protestant churches. These tokens have long been an object of much interest, both to the collector and the antiquarian and numismatist, to whom they still present numerous unsolvable puzzles. They are medals, averaging an inch in diameter and almost exclusively of lead, which were given at stated intervals by the elders to those persons who were entitled to come to the communion. The custom originated in the first days of the Reformation, having been recommended by Calvin himself from the difficulty of distinguishing between the true and the false believers. During the days of persecution, when spies frequented the secret meetings of the proscribed church, they served as badges of membership simply. A number of these tokens, of which each distinct congregation generally had its own, are reproduced in the *Bulletin*. The most interesting, as well as the most ancient, dating back to the sixteenth century, is one having on the obverse a figure of Christ in a short coat and trunk hose, bareheaded and sounding a horn, which he holds in one hand, while in the other is a shepherd's crook. On the reverse are the words in French, "Fear not, little flock." The most common form is a medal having the eucharistic cup rudely stamped on the obverse, and the initials of the town in which the church is, together with other symbols or ornaments, according to the fancy of the maker, not infrequently one of the elders, on the reverse. These tokens were used for two centuries, but are now given up except in one village.

—Africa still claims the largest share of the geographers' attention, three of the four articles in *Petermann's Mittheilungen* for July being upon that continent. The first is Dr. L. Wolf's report of his explorations of the Sankuru, a tributary of the Kassai, the largest of the southern branches of the Congo. Some idea may be formed of the extent of these great streams from the fact that in the middle course of the Sankuru it is often two miles wide and ten feet deep. It flows through a fertile country, still densely populated, though the slave-traders, attracted by the abundance of ivory, had already begun their desolating ravages. The medium height of the land in Africa F. Heiderich shows to be 2,208 feet, a different result from that which Dr. John Murray reached in similar investigations published in the *Scottish Geographical Magazine* for January. Dr. Junker contributes a pathetic account of the fate of the European prisoners in Khartum, brought by two messengers who reached Cairo last May and June. These unfortunates are Lupton-Bey, an Englishman, Slatin-Bey, an Austrian, Neufeld, a German, three missionaries and four nuns, who are Austrian and Italian. These last are allowed their freedom, as being harmless, and earn a precarious living by their labor. Lupton has till recently been doing the lowest and most difficult work in the arsenal, such as shovelling and carrying, dressed only in underdrawers and felt hat. Slatin is footman to the Mahdi, who takes great pride in the fact that a Christian and former governor of a province should hold his stirrup and run before his horse. Neufeld is kept in chains, for what reason is not stated, and has twice been led to the gallows and nearly hanged. The messengers report that misery, want of money, clothing, and food reign in Khartum, and that hangings and murders are frequent. There are also bitter dissensions between the Mahdi and

some of his chiefs. One of the messengers says that 500 well-armed Turkish or Egyptian soldiers, without English, could gain possession of the city within three months. The first of the two set out on the 5th of June in the disguise of a dervish to return to Khartum, having letters, about four times the size of a postage-stamp, for the captives, sewed into his clothing. Dr. Junker believes with Gen. Gordon that Zebehr Pasha is the man who could most easily restore the Sudan to Egypt. The editor is inclined to the opinion that Stanley is the "white pasha" reported as advancing against the Mahdi in the province Bahr el-Ghazal, though he regards it as not improbable that his object is not Khartum, but a union with Emin Pasha. The fourth article is on the "Caves of the United States," by C. Fruhwirth.

—Some time ago, in these columns, attention was called to the supposed indebtedness of Whately for the idea of his 'Historic Doubts relative to Napoleon' to a pamphlet by J. B. Pérès, entitled 'Comme quoi Napoléon n'a jamais existé,' and it was then shown that Whately's pamphlet was written years before that of Pérès, and that if there was any indebtedness, it must have been on the part of the latter. It may be worth noting that in *Mélusine* for July 5, the pamphlet by Pérès forms the subject of a very interesting article by H. Gaidoz, who gives some additional particulars concerning Pérès and his works. It seems that Barbier's remark that the preface to the third (anonymous) edition of 'Comme quoi,' etc., signed P. B., is by Petrus Borel, has led some cataloguers to place the work under that name, which Gaidoz tells us was the pseudonym of E. Bouchery, thus causing additional confusion. It is interesting to learn that the second and third editions (Paris, 1836) were due to the exertions of Pastor Frederic Monod, the chief editor of the *Archives du Christianisme*, who saw in this satire a powerful weapon against the theories of Dupuis, then attracting much attention.

—A considerable portion of the article in *Mélusine* is devoted to an analysis of Whately's 'Historic Doubts,' showing that though Pérès wrote his essay long after Whately's had appeared, there is little probability that he is in any way indebted to the English writer, and there remains merely a simple coincidence of subject. It is noted that 'Comme quoi Napoléon n'a jamais existé' has been translated into Dutch and Italian, and that an English translation may be found in *Philobiblion*; but no mention is made of the two English translations which appeared almost simultaneously in London in 1885. It would seem that a German translation also exists, for Miss E. J. Whately, in a letter to the Manchester *Guardian*, says that the first time her father saw the solar-myth tract of Pérès was in the form of a German translation, sent him by a friend about 1840. She adds that her father was much amused by the ingenuity with which Pérès's idea was worked out, but saw that the two tracts took totally different lines of argument, Whately's being written to disprove Hume's axiom concerning testimony by a *reductio ad absurdum*, while Pérès wrote to answer the myth theory of Dupuis. In referring to the additions made by Whately to the later editions of 'Historic Doubts,' showing how the death of Napoleon at St. Helena, the advent to power of Louis Napoleon, etc., could all be made to confirm his theory, M. Gaidoz adds that were the author still living he might find, in one of the recent Parisian idols of the day a new avatar of the Napoleonic Dalai-lama, and quotes the *Temps* to show how the country people a few months ago were assured that Boulanger is a Bona-

parte, and a grandson of Napoleon I. Then, too, was not 'le boulanger' the name given by the populace in 1789 to the head of the State? Other explanations of the name may also suggest themselves, which would help to strengthen this position. The article concludes with a rather scornful reference to the principal upholders of the solar-myth theory in France, who seem to be at the head of the "Société des Traditions populaires," and a disparaging mention of the *Revue des Traditions populaires* published by that society.

—In the *American Meteorological Journal* Prof. Winslow Upton has presented the observations made by himself and Mr. Lawrence Rotch during the total solar eclipse of August, 1887, near Ivanovo, about 160 miles to the northeast of Moscow. Meteorological observations on such occasions are not easy to interpret; the fluctuations noted may be due to the eclipse itself, or to other conditions prevailing at the time, and it is not always possible to decide upon the true cause or causes of the observed effects. Fall in temperature and rise in humidity are obviously to be expected when the sun's heat is temporarily cut off; and these are always observed, though in varying degree. But the cause of fluctuations in the air-pressure and in the direction and velocity of the wind has not yet been definitely determined; and, on account of their minuteness, they are apt to be concealed in the greater fluctuations assignable to other causes. Meteorological stations were found to be quite numerous in the eclipse-region of Germany and Russia, and the weather-services of these nations cooperated with Prof. Upton in securing detailed observations of the chief meteorological elements every five minutes during the period of three hours adjacent to the time of greatest obscuration; also at intervals more frequent than usual on the days preceding and following the eclipse. The definitive discussion of this mass of observations will form perhaps the most valuable contribution to science which the last eclipse afforded; in fact, the astronomers everywhere, from Germany to Japan, met with chilling disappointment, while the meteorologists had pretty much the whole eclipse to themselves.

—The next total eclipse of the sun occurs on January 1, 1889, and it is to be hoped that astronomers as well as meteorologists may be successful. However, the outlook is perhaps better for the latter than the former. Totality is not very long, something like two minutes in the best places, which lie nearly one hundred miles to the north of San Francisco. Thence the eclipse track runs easterly across northern Nevada; curving more and more to the north, it crosses the Yellowstone National Park, and leaves the earth in British America about four hundred miles northwest of Lake Superior. It is doubtful if the phenomenon will attract observers to any great extent. The Director of the Lick Observatory has lately printed all the available meteorological data relating to the California region in question, and there is no eclipse observer who would, on such a showing, consider the prospect otherwise than forbidding. January, he says, is a particularly unfortunate time of the year for astronomical work, since it falls in the middle of the wet season, when it is possible that rainy periods of a week or more may be experienced all over northern California. Railway and other transportation facilities are good. Californian institutions will take prominent part in the proposed observations. Time signals will be sent out from the Observatory at suitable intervals adjacent to the eclipse, but observing parties will have to determine their own positions.

Foreign visitors are welcomed to Mount Hamilton, and, in probable default of fine observing weather, are promised a magnificent mountain view at least.

—Dr. Thierler, the Mayor of Jena, recently discovered in the city archives and published in the *Jenaische Zeitung* (July 25) the record of an interesting and amusing suit. This was no less than that brought by "Herr Geheime Rath von Goethe" against his caterer for overcharging him. It seems that from April 20 to April 29, 1812, Goethe had his dinners served by "Hoftraiteur Steinert," himself, preparing each morning the bill of fare, and requiring of Steinert "dass er die Braten alle ganz geben müsse; portionenweiss dürfe er ihm nichts geben." The bills of fare, preserved in the archives, are as follows:

"April 20. Dinner for two. Soup *au jus*, red cabbage with cutlets, stewed carp, roast pigeon, dessert, 1 reichsthaler, 6 groschen;—for the coachman, dinner and 1 glass of beer, 4 groschen, 6 pfennig. April 21. Dinner for two. Sago soup, pigeons with hop-sprigs, baked custard, roast kidney, dessert, 1 r. 6 gr.;—dinner and 1 glass of beer for the coachman, 4 gr. 6 pf.;—larded partridge roasted, 6 gr. April 22. Dinner for two. Barley soup, spinach with fried sausage, roast beef with mustard and roast pork, dessert, 1 r. 6 gr.;—coachman, 4 gr. 6 pf.;—two roast pigeons, 6 gr.;—supper and 1 glass of beer for the coachman, 4 gr. 6 pf. April 23. Dinner for two. Egg soup, hop-sprigs with cutlets, chicken-fricassee, roast kidney, dessert, 1 r. 6 gr.;—coachman, 4 gr. 6 pf.;—roast capon, 16 gr. April 24. Dinner for two. Soup with dumplings, surloin with anchovy sauce, farina pudding, mutton roast, lettuce, 1 r. 6 gr.;—two stuffed pigeons roasted, 6 gr.;—coachman, 4 gr. 6 pf.;—ham-salad for two, 8 gr. April 25. Dinner for two. Soup *au jus*, potatoes, hop-sprigs with cutlets, fricassee of calf's sweetbread, roast lamb, lettuce, 1 r. 6 gr.;—for the coachman, 4 gr. 6 pf. April 26. Dinner for two. Rice soup, surloin with anchovy sauce, cabbage with cutlets, roast lamb, dessert, 1 r. 6 gr.;—two roasted pigeons, 2 gr. April 27. Dinner for four. Soup *au jus*, sweetmeat with wine sauce, spinach with cutlets, potato-pudding, roast capon, lettuce, 3 r. 8 gr.;—roast and lettuce for two, 8 gr.;—for the coachman, breakfast, 4 gr.;—twice dinner and 1 glass of beer, 9 gr. April 28. Roast and lettuce for three, 12 gr. April 29. Dinner for four. Soup *à la Sauter*, veal fricassee, carp *en matelots*, mutton-roast, lettuce, 2 r. 16 gr.;—roast capon, 16 gr.;—broth, 9 gr.;—supper for two, 8 gr. Total, 20 reichsthaler, 15 gr. 6 pf. (about \$15)."

Various cooks and landladies were summoned to give their judgment as to the fairness of the charges; some thought they could have furnished it a thaler or so cheaper, but Madame Hübschmann had the courage to intimate that in her opinion it was pretty small in a "Geheime Rath" to stickle at the price of a dinner that had been served as was due so high a personage. The result of the investigation was that the caterer's bill was cut down by 15 gr. 6 pf. (about 45c.), and Herr Geheime Rath von Goethe was so much the richer for his prosecution.

DONNELLY AND HIS CIPHER.

The Great Cryptogram: Francis Bacon's Cipher in the So-called Shakespeare Plays. By Ignatius Donnelly. Chicago: R. S. Peale & Co. 1888.

THE Baconian theory of the authorship of Shakspeare's plays is now an old story. The argument for it has been repeatedly threshed out. It starts from the primary assumption that a mind which left no other evidence of itself than the plays could not have produced them, and it ends in the second assumption that Bacon, who stands next to Shakspeare in the intellectual history of that age, must have been their author. The rest of the case consists of parallelisms of phrase and metaphor between

the two authors, and the fact that Bacon was certainly acquainted with the common store of human learning. Mr. Donnelly rehearses the tale, oblivious of the destructive criticism which has been directed against it for a generation. What he adds is his discovery of a cipher in which Bacon has written his autobiography, with the expectation that posterity would discover it. This profound secret was not to be eternally sunk deeper than ever plummet sounded, but in the successions of time was to rise and reveal Bacon's greatness. There is no hint in any of his authentic writings to put the men of later times upon the scent. Yet, from an early period in his career, he had determined upon this method of addressing the future, and he practised it for years. He had, says Mr. Donnelly, a talent for secretiveness.

The secret, however, was known to his contemporaries; not the existence of the cipher, but the fact of Bacon's authorship. Spenser knew it, and, in his well-known lament for our "pleasant Willy," told it. This is the manner of his telling:

"And he, the man whom Nature's self had made
To mock herself and truth to imitate,
With kindly counter under mimic shade,
Our pleasant Willy, ah! is dead of late."

On which Mr. Donnelly comments (and it is a fair example of his learning) as follows:

"The word *counter* is not known to our dictionaries in any sense that is consonant with the meaning of these lines. I take it to be a poetical abbreviation of 'counterfeit,' and this view is confirmed by the further statement that this gentle-born playwright, who despised the base-born play-makers, imitated truth under a *shade* or disguise; and this disguise was a *mimic* one, to wit, that of a *mime*—an actor."

It is more natural to suppose that *counter* is our word *encounter*, when the meaning becomes clear and the expression proper to a pastoral poet; and at least one of "our dictionaries," the Imperial, sustains this interpretation, citing Spenser's usage.

It would be superfluous, however, to enter into an examination of Mr. Donnelly's understanding of Elizabethan English. Perhaps the most easy example is where he comes to his proof that Jonson also knew the secret. He quotes Jonson's statement that Bacon had "filled up all numbers," and explains it—"that is to say, he had compassed all forms of poetical composition"! Ignorance could not stand more nakedly confessed than in this perversion of a common Latinism. Jonson's verses on Shakspeare have always been a stumbling-block in the way of the Baconians. Mr. Donnelly finds them not insuperable. Jonson was addressing Bacon all the time, and his lament for Shakspeare is really a private appeal to Bacon to write more plays:

"Sweet swan of Avon! what a sight it were
To see thee in our waters yet appear."

*Shine forth, thou Starre of Poets, and with rage
Or influence chide or cheer the drooping stage;*"

only the lines should be repunctuated in some parts, especially where Jonson refers to the portrait:

"O, could he but have drawn his wit
As well in brass as he hath hit
His face, the print would then surpass
All that was ever writ—in brass!"

One difficulty, however, immediately occurs to the reader; it is in this passage that Jonson reproaches the poet with "small Latine and less Greek." Mr. Donnelly thinks that this was directed, in the pride of scholarship, at Bacon, whose "Promus" contains several errors in the Latin and Greek; "how 'rare old Ben,'" exclaims Mr. Donnelly, "must have enjoyed whacking Bacon over Shakspeare's shoulders, in verses written at the request of Bacon!"

We are not yet at the end of Bacon's confidants. Nash knew the secret when he sneered at those "who leave the trade of *noverint*,

where to they were born," to busy themselves with play-writing. This was in 1587, and Spenser's knowledge was at least as early. Essex knew it, of course, as the chief conspirator in the group that used the theatres to stir up discontent with Elizabeth, by means of "Richard II."; and Bacon's servant, Harry Percy, who was the go-between in dealing with the players, knew it. Cecil knew it, himself the model after whom "Richard III." was drawn (both being humpbacked), and used his knowledge to keep Bacon out of favor with the Queen, to whom Cecil told it as well as to King James. Certain of the Cecil party must have known it when they sent out to arrest Shakspeare, according to Mr. Donnelly. Coke certainly knew it, and insulted Bacon openly with it, so that Bacon applied to Cecil to have his mouth stopped on the subject. Bacon's brother, Anthony, knew it, and furnished the Italian backgrounds; his friend, Sir Tobie Matthew, was acquainted even with the existence of the cipher in the plays, and compliments Bacon on the Folio of 1623; the printers, Hemynge and Condell, knew it, and had to take great pains with the bracketed and italicised words, else the cipher would have been irretrievably confused and lost. But the list is long enough. This secret, known to many men for a period of forty years at the shortest, was never told. It was hinted at in verse and prose, if Mr. Donnelly's interpretations be accepted, but it was never told. No syllable of it was ever explicitly put down in any records, letters, gossip, or what-not, and even the tradition of it died out utterly. So much for "the secret."

What of the cipher? Mr. Donnelly does not tell what it is. He even acknowledges that he has not completely worked out the rule of it; but he hopes to solve it entirely some time. From the description he gives it appears to be a word-cipher, determined by arithmetical relations to some starting-point, whence, by the aid of the numbers of the pages and the number of bracketed and italicised words, one counts backward and forward some hundreds of words, and so picks out the significant ones. It is an extraordinarily complicated cipher, and the labor of unravelling it has been herculean. There is no question of the labor Mr. Donnelly has expended. It is the only thing about which there is no question. But, leaving the cipher, which is not submitted to us for judgment, what does the cipher tell us? Is it written in Bacon's style and in Elizabethan English? The substance of the cipher, so far as Mr. Donnelly gives it in full, is the defamation of Shakspeare, boy and man. Bacon seems to have been more concerned with heaping ignominy upon his tool for the sake of posterity than in any attempt to entertain his living audience. Of the sort of disgrace which is thus put upon Shakspeare, we can but refrain from speaking. It is of the sort that would soil the foulest pen. It is natural for a Baconian to find great interest in all that makes for Shakspeare's personal discredit, and it is on this account that Mr. Donnelly has chosen these passages to give to the world first. It is singular that he should have hit on this description of the youth and manhood of the vagabond debauchee before he met with anything else. The tradition of Sir Thomas Lucy is sustained and much amplified by the narrative, the character of Shakspeare's wife is limned with coarse colors, and the appearance of Shakspeare among his family is so told that one cares to hear no more. So far as Shakspeare is concerned, as here described to us by Bacon, who even stops to tell us what the wretch had for breakfast, we do not know where in history or fiction a more degrading characterization is to be found.

The cipher-narrative is not confined to these unsavory and revolting details. It is well spiced with other matter. The conspiracy of Essex is touched on; Bacon takes ratsbane, and is only saved from death because he took an overdose which his stomach rejected; the Queen beats poor Hayward, who was arrested on account of dedicating a book to Essex, in a scene quite the most violent that we have of "the old jade," as the cipher designates her. There is action and color enough. The revelations are by no means tame. If Bacon's autobiography keeps up as it has begun, it will be a treasure for the lover of strong sensations. It is true that in the style of the composition one discerns no trace of the hand that wrote the "Merchant of Venice" or the "Essays," and the English has not the sequence and turn of Elizabeth's great age; but the words are from the plays. Such is the matter of what Bacon, at inconceivable pains to himself, took the trouble to dovetail into the plays in order to address that posterity to which he left his memory. Was it not enough to have drawn *Falstaff* from Shakspeare and *Dame Quickly* from Ann Hathaway, as the cipher assures us he did, and to have afterward framed *Caliban* in the image of the Stratford peasant player, as Mr. Donnelly thinks was done? For when *Prospero* leaves the isle to the "moon-calf," Mr. Donnelly holds it is Bacon abandoning the plays to Shakspeare.

It becomes apparent to the student of this controversy that what the Baconians really claim is, that Bacon was the whole Elizabethan age. This is the only inference to be drawn from their "parallelism" and "metaphors," etc. Any word, phrase, or image that Bacon uses is his exclusively. The argument assumes that there was no common language, no common stock of figures, no common nature in the working of all poetic minds. It is pitiable to find a pretending scholar citing "extraordinary" words in Bacon and Shakspeare as if they were not also in a dozen other authors of the time. But it is not our intention to repeat old lines of argument. Mr. Donnelly is argument enough, taken by himself. He does not shrink from asserting that Bacon was the whole Elizabethan age. It is the natural conclusion of the Baconian theory, and it has been reached. Bacon, he says, appeared before Shakspeare; he began writing early for the stage, perhaps ten years before Shakspeare's entrance in 1592, if we adopt that date. There were many plays, some of which are extant, which various scholars have attributed to Shakspeare's hand; there were other old plays which Shakspeare rewrote; and there were Marlowe's plays. Bacon wrote them all. Mr. Donnelly thinks he had many of them printed between 1607 and 1613 in order to show his progress "from *Stuckley* and *Fair Em* to *Othello* and *Lear*." Bacon wrote the pre-Shaksperian drama, in other words. At first he used Marlowe as his mask, but Marlowe got killed, and then he had to find another "safe" fool; and took up with Shakspeare.

The drama, however, is but a part of Elizabethan literature. Bacon also wrote the "Anatomy of Melancholy." But the most extraordinary of his "masks" was Montaigne. It seems that Bacon wrote the "Essays" and got Montaigne to translate them into French; then after that version appeared he persuaded old Florio to father the original English which he had himself composed. How else, asks Mr. Donnelly, could Florio have written Baconian English, parallelism in phrase and metaphor and all? This is the reverse of the adage, for here the ridiculous really passes into the sublime. Florio and Montaigne were accomplices in the

great secret, too. After this no one will wink when he finds "Mrs. Pott" alleging that she "sees the signs of the *Promus* notes and other Baconianisms of thought and expression not only in the plays of Marlowe, but in the writings of Marston, Massinger, Middleton, Greene, Shirley, and Webster"; and Mr. Donnelly has "great confidence in her penetration and judgment." The Baconians are not lacking in courage. It only remains for them now to tackle King James's Bible.

Mr. Donnelly has a great work before him. The cipher was not an incident in the plays; it was their topic, their marrow. He revels in the prospect:

"What a volume of historical truths will roll out of the text of this great volume! The inner life of kings and queens, the highest, perhaps the basest, of their kind; the struggles of factions in the courts; the interior view of the birth of religions; the first colonization of the American continent, in which Bacon took an active part, and something of which is hidden in the 'Tempest'; the death of Mary, Queen of Scots; the Spanish Armada, told in 'Love's Labor Lost'; the religious wars on the Continent; the story of Henry of Navarre; the real biography of Essex; the real story of Bacon's career; his defence of his life, hidden in 'Henry VIII.'; his own downfall in cipher being in the external story of the downfall of Wolsey."

In Shakspeare we had but one story, the supreme one of the plays; but the possible rearrangement of so many hundred thousand words will suffice for an endless narrative of history in infinite volumes.

Mr. Donnelly has evidently but a small library; his acquaintance with literature is narrow and largely second-hand, and his familiarity with Elizabethan books is of the scantiest. He is unfurnished with scholarship or its implements; but he has the cipher, and that will suffice for the rest of his literary days. He has the secret of Bacon, lost since those days when his servant Harry Percy went to receive the author's share of the profits from the nightly performance, and was perhaps spied by Cecil's agents "in some dark alley"—for Bacon, like our friend of former days, Shakspeare, worked for base hire out of poverty. This is with the other marvellous facts. Shakspeare has disappeared in Bacon, and now Bacon is disappearing in his cipher. The plays are necessarily subordinate to the "veiled writing." We used to call it Shakspeare's miraculous diction; but now Mr. Donnelly, who never shrinks, tells us that many of the finest gems of Shakspeare's language are due merely "to the necessities of the cipher." This truth will grow more plain as the cipher extends its tentacle arms backward and forward through these curves, with the accompanying tables of what look like logarithms and read like lottery-numbers infinitely prolonged. Why does one think of Lilly, the astrologer, and of Bickerstaff, and wonder if the old almanack-maker really did not die, after all? Perhaps it will be as well—it will certainly be easier—for the inquiring student to content himself with Mr. Spedding's weighty remark, that in all his study of Bacon he has never seen any sign that the great philosopher ever read a line of Shakspeare.

HARRISON'S OLIVER CROMWELL.—II.
Oliver Cromwell. By Frédéric Harrison.
[Twelve English Statesmen.] Macmillan & Co. 1888.

"NEVER did a leader invested with absolute power and overwhelming military force more obstinately strive to surround his authority with legal limits and Parliamentary control." These are the words in which Mr. Harrison describes the attempts of the Puritan statesman to found a constitution. These, and with them the whole

of Cromwell's policy, have been misunderstood. Carlyle, who hated Parliaments, did not understand why his hero voluntarily submitted to Parliamentary control. Liberals who have perceived that Cromwell hated despotism, have fancied that Cromwell wished for the kind of Parliamentary government which now exists in England. Mr. Harrison has avoided each error; he has suggested the right way of looking at Cromwell's ideal of government. He has unfortunately confined himself to suggestions. Cromwellian constitutionalism will never fully be understood until it is examined and expounded in detail by Mr. Gardiner. Meanwhile, a reviewer may with advantage expand Mr. Harrison's suggestions, and try to describe the point of view from which Cromwell's reforms ought to be regarded by intelligent critics. As a constitution maker, as in every other part of his public life, Cromwell is a conservative revolutionist.

In more than one point his policy was revolutionary. He aimed at securing freedom of religious opinion for all Protestants. On this matter he was in full sympathy with a few extreme sectaries. His toleration, it will be said, was incomplete; it was, however, far in advance of any measure of religious freedom which would have been granted by Anglicans or by Presbyterians. If Cromwell's views had prevailed, England would never have been cursed with the odious social division between members of the Church of England and Non-conformists. The Toleration Act, no doubt, relieved Dissenters from practical oppression, but the policy of which the Toleration Act was, so to speak, the outward sign, stereotyped the distinction between Churchmen and Nonconformists, and thereby will probably prove in the end fatal to the existence of a national church. Cromwell, again, was determined (and in this he sympathized with all the best men of his age) to free England once and for all from arbitrary government. Modern hero-worshippers may fancy that the men who had risked their lives in the cause of the Parliament, despised Parliamentary authority. No delusion is more baseless. It may be doubted if any man, whether a Roundhead or a Cavalier, who cared for the good of the country, wished to get rid of Parliaments. A king who legislated uncontrolled by the advice of Parliament would be a despot, and Englishmen who knew what despotism meant on the Continent, were determined not to submit to a rule like that of the Bourbons. Cromwell, moreover—and in this he was a revolutionist—clearly meant that no future ruler should be able to elude the remonstrances of the country by refusing to call a Parliament. The Instrument of Government provided specifically that Parliament should be convened at fixed intervals. He anticipated, further, and more than anticipated, the policy embodied in the Acts of Union with Ireland and Scotland. Under the Instrument of Government, or (to use modern expressions) the Constitution of 1654, the Channel Islands, as well as Scotland and Ireland, were to send representatives to Westminster. Add to this that the franchise was placed on a clear and rational basis, that the number of the House of Commons was fixed at four hundred, and that a systematic redistribution of seats anticipated and would have made needless the later demand for Parliamentary reform. Two other facts deserve special attention. The Protector's power over ordinary legislation was confined to a suspensive veto. "Fundamentals"—what modern writers would call "constitutional guarantees"—could not be changed in the same manner as laws; the principles of the Constitution could be altered, if at all, only

with the assent of the Protector. The Constitution of 1654 was intended to effect a revolution. It secured religious freedom, it insured the legislative authority of Parliament, it placed the foundations of the Constitution above the risk of sudden change.

The Instrument of Government gave England a new Constitution, yet it was emphatically a work of conservative statesmanship. Some of the changes which it introduced may have seemed to its authors no more than the formal recognition of admitted principles. Charles's attempt to govern without a Parliament was admitted to be unconstitutional. The King's power of refusing his sanction to a bill carried through Parliament was an exercise of authority which was felt to be dangerous, and thoughtful men already perceived that a suspensive veto which could be used, might give greater weight to the head of the Commonwealth than an absolute veto which it might become more and more dangerous to use. Even the hindrances placed in the way of changing the fundamental principles of the Constitution were in keeping, not with any rule of law, but with principles recognized by the constitutional lawyers of the seventeenth century. Coke would have denied in theory that Parliament had a right to override the principles of the common law; and the notion that the legislature is morally justified in changing fundamental laws is of comparatively recent growth.

The point, however, wherein the Constitution of 1654 most markedly shows its conservative character, is the position it assigns to the Protector. In Cromwell's view, England needed a strong Executive, at the head of which should stand some one person, who, whether he were called President or King, should be a real ruler. He wished in one shape or another to keep alive the kingship. He was fully determined that the Executive of the Commonwealth should neither be Parliament nor a Parliamentary Committee. The thorough-going Parliamentarians wished, to use Mr. Harrison's words, "to establish the autocracy of an elected House, supreme over the Executive, and free from any constitutional limit." Cromwell's idea was that there should be an Executive authority not directly subordinate to Parliament, and that the fundamental bases of the Constitution should not be alterable like ordinary laws. As a constitutionalist, Cromwell agreed with the ablest and the most public-spirited among the upholders of royal authority. He felt as strongly as did Bacon the evils that might be involved in the absolute supremacy of Parliament. He, however, perceived more clearly than the upholders of the prerogative, that in England no Executive could be permanently powerful which did not consult the will of the nation as expressed in Parliament, and that a ruler's powers ought to be given him by the Constitution, and not to depend on a vague "prerogative," liable at once to undue extension and to undue curtailment. Once grasp Cromwell's position, and we can understand both why he was utterly averse to governing without Parliament, and why he was never able to come to terms with Parliamentarians.

There is a considerable element of truth in Mr. Harrison's assertion that Cromwell's position "was exactly that of Washington, of Hamilton, Jay, and Madison." He, like the founders of the United States, wished for an Executive which should occupy a sphere separate from that of the legislative body, and for a legislature which should legislate and should not govern. The powers, nominally at any rate, conferred on the President would have satisfied the Protector, subject to two provisos, namely, that the powers should be really exer-

cisable at the will of the ruler, and that the ruler should hold office for life. The only expression in Mr. Harrison's statement with which we quarrel is the word "exactly." We greatly doubt whether Cromwell's ideal was not far more nearly that of Bismarck than of Washington. No one supposes that the German Chancellor wishes to abolish the Reichstag or to destroy the Prussian Parliament. What he does wish—and for the time he has attained his wish—is that the Parliaments should confine themselves to legislation, and should not interfere with the action of the Executive. His old quarrel with the Prussian House of Representatives shows, indeed, that the line between legislation and administration cannot be strictly drawn. The Chancellor would assert that where the rights of the legislative and the administrative authority of the Government conflict, the representative body should give way. But Bismarck, no doubt, would also contend that where the people are sensible and the Government is patriotic, such conflicts ought not to arise. This, we take it, was the Protector's own conviction. His permanent, and from his point of view righteous, complaint was, that the Commonwealth's men would not accept the constitutional position of Parliament. Not content with legislation, they would encroach upon the sphere of the Government. To put Cromwell's views in another shape, he wished to establish formally what to the English people had been for generations the ideal of good government, namely, the rule of a powerful and patriotic monarch who, like Elizabeth at her best, should carry out the wishes of the nation, and, while listening with respect to the Houses of Parliament, should yet represent the country more truly than any assembly. This and not government by Parliament was the aim of Oliver's constitutionalism. It was not the aim of men like Vane or Bradshaw, but we may suspect that it far more nearly represented the wishes of the English people than did the ideas of more thorough-going Parliamentarians.

An apprehension of Cromwell's aim enables us to appreciate with fairness his obvious indifference to means. He was willing to have come to terms with Charles, if only Charles had shown himself capable of respecting the constitutional principles which in Cromwell's eyes were all-important. It can, we think, hardly be doubted that he would have been willing himself to accept the position of king. It may be perfectly true that, as he said, he valued the title not more than "a feather in his hat"; but he must have felt more keenly than most men the real and weighty arguments in favor of the kingship. "A 'King' was a legal, constitutional, traditional, familiar functionary; a 'Protector' was a provisional *locum tenens*, with no known prerogatives, no known limits, an indefinite and unfamiliar makeshift." And a king armed with the authority of Cromwell, and supported by Parliament, would have been just the kind of ruler whom in Cromwell's judgment England needed. His refusal of the kingship was, we may take it, due in part to policy, and in part to his real respect for the opinion of the army and of "good" men. Is it not allowable to suppose that he hoped, if his life continued, the time would come when the opinion of the army would change, and he might honestly recognize in the wishes of the saints the sign of the will of God? The revised Constitution of 1657 looks strangely like a stage towards the restoration of the monarchy.

It is one of the paradoxes of history that the restoration of royalty under Charles II. was in reality the destruction of the English kingship.

Events proved, or seemed to prove, that for England the choice lay between royal despotism of the Continental type, and government by Parliament. That the English people should, when this alternative was placed before them, choose government by Parliament was inevitable. But crises occur when the best friends of freedom may regret that the Cromwellian experiment of a strong Executive, respecting and respected by an independent Legislature, never received a fair trial. There is little good, however, in wasting thought over the tempting but useless problem of "what might have been." The experiment was doomed from the first to failure. Cromwell, with all his merits, lacked the patience, and we must add the self-control, needed by the architect of a constitution. His innovations were in advance of his times; his conservatism estranged his natural supporters. Experience, moreover, showed that for at least a century after Cromwell's death the English aristocracy had the power and (let it be conceded) the capacity to rule the English people. The Republicanism of the Commonwealth, even under its most conservative form, was premature. A careful study, indeed, of a period which, from a legal and constitutional point of view, has been too much neglected, will, it may be conjectured, show that the legislation of the Long Parliament and of the Protectorate left much more permanent traces on English law than is generally believed. Still, the history of Puritanism and of the Puritan leader will always have in it an element of tragedy; it is a tale of heroic efforts and of splendid triumphs ending in failure. The Cromwellian Constitution of 1654 is a noble fabric planned by architects of original genius; but from the first it rested on no solid foundation, and students examine its details with the interest excited by the ruins of an uncompleted palace.

First Steps in Geometry: a Series of Hints for the Solution of Geometrical Problems, with Notes on Euclid, Useful Working Propositions, and Many Examples. By Richard A. Proctor. Longmans, Green & Co. 12mo, pp. viii, 179.

Easy Lessons in the Differential Calculus: indicating from the outset the utility of the processes called Differentiation and Integration. By Richard A. Proctor. Longmans. 12mo, pp. vi, 114.

MR. PROCTOR has written a great many books, most of them instructive, all of them interesting. How much he has contributed to the sum of human knowledge is a question we are not now called upon to discuss; but he has certainly done much to excite the curiosity of the many who know little, and impel them to seek information from the few who know much, in regard to a great variety of subjects. He seems lately to have been taking a retrospective glance at his own education, and to have been recalling the difficulties which he encountered and the incitements which urged him on. In this review two things appear to have especially impressed him: the difficulties he met with in the study of Geometry, and the surprise and pleasure he felt when he found that, by the processes of the Differential Calculus, he could solve, with wonderful ease and facility, certain problems in which he was interested. Neither of these experiences has anything very novel about it. Geometry, as usually taught, is, to the great majority of students, in its earlier stages a sort of mental torture; and when they have succeeded in learning the amount required to enter college, they are able to do hardly anything. The principal object of most text-books

of Geometry seems to be to teach logic rather than to give the pupil a knowledge of one of the most useful and beautiful of the sciences. They shrink from any departure from the traditional manner lest it should "lack rigor." As to the Calculus, Snell, in his treatise on that science, published nearly half a century ago, remarks that when we consider the nature of the problems with which it deals, its formulas seem to have about them something truly magical (*wahre Zauberformeln*).

But novelty or originality of ideas is to Mr. Proctor of far less importance than attractiveness of presentation. There is nothing which the readers of newspapers look for with more eagerness than the accounts of occurrences about which they already know more than any reporter can possibly tell them. In the same way, all are eager to see how a writer who has often afforded them pleasure deals with even the most commonplace idea. For all this Mr. Proctor has a sense sharpened by long and profitable experience. He has accordingly, as is his custom, made the experiences above referred to the occasion for writing two new books, small but neat, ingenious, and taking—so far as these latter adjectives can be predicated of books relating to pure mathematics. From the general title, 'First Steps in Geometry,' one would almost inevitably infer that the book on Geometry was intended for those commencing the study of that science. It is not this at all. It is not a text-book, but a sort of companion to the text-book. It may be said generally that the book presupposes an acquaintance with the first two books of Euclid. In the solution of the first problem which Mr. Proctor treats there is a reference to Euclid, and two more before he goes to the next problem. The sub-title explains fairly well the character of the book. It is not an exposition of any regular system for the solution of geometrical problems, but is mostly made up of observations and illustrations, the former distinguished for their good sense, the latter for their ingenuity and attractiveness. Almost any one, teacher or pupil, will find the book useful, and, what Mr. Proctor always aims at and generally attains, interesting.

The little treatise on the Calculus is intended for a text-book. Mr. Proctor calls it 'Easy Lessons,' but tells us in his preface that "rather less" than it contains was sufficient for him to get his degree, at Cambridge, and to prepare him for further acquisitions in after life. To be easy, to contain enough, and more than enough to get a degree, and to be a sufficient preparation for acquiring more, should the occasion for more ever arise, and all this in the compass of 114 small pages in large type, is about all that either pupil or professor could reasonably demand. It is certainly unfortunate that in the very first equation in so promising a book (p. 4, near the top), and that, too, the corner-stone of the whole structure, by a "printer's error" and a proof-reader's negligence, the coefficient $\frac{1}{2}$ has been omitted from the last term of the left-hand member, so that the equation is no equation at all. Near the bottom of the same page, by a similar error, we have a minus sign in place of a sign of equality, thus again making nonsense. Mr. Proctor discusses (p. 59, *et seq.*) a problem in regard to the height of a light so situated that a point in a plane below may receive the maximum amount of illumination. In discussing one of the cases of this problem he says (the italics are his own): "Suppose, for example, *a* is equal to eight degrees, the slope of my desk, for I have taken the notion of working out this particular problem with the practical design of determining how high I should set the

moderator which illuminates the paper I am writing upon." Then, after showing in detail how the problem is solved, always in the first person singular, he concludes: "I find that the best height for the light of the moderator (above the surface of the table) is, as nearly as possible, 18 $\frac{1}{2}$ in." This autobiographical manner of treating a problem in *maxima* and *minima* has real advantages. The young students who use the book can but be impressed by the wisdom of a man who fixes the height of his light by the Differential Calculus, and all this contributes to increase the sale of Mr. Proctor's next book, which, as we write, is already in process of publication. We cannot, however, withhold the expression of our conviction that, whatever may be the case at Cambridge, some of the treatises on the Calculus with which we are acquainted are better adapted to the wants of those seeking a degree at Harvard, or Yale, or Columbia than Mr. Proctor's.

The Art of Investing. By a New York Broker. D. Appleton & Co. 1888.

THE good judgment which characterizes most of this book manifests itself in the title. The author recognizes that investing is not a science, to be taught deductively, but an art, which can be learned only by experience. He therefore keeps well under control his happy faculty for coining aphorisms, and confines himself chiefly to giving significant facts drawn from business experience. Taking up, one after another, the various classes of investments, he shows in an interesting way the peculiar dangers attending each. In this portion of his work the only serious blunder made is where the author digresses into constitutional history, and maintains that "the Eleventh Amendment, which inhibits the suing of States by private parties, thus taking away a right previously existing, was meant to cut off certain claims growing out of the Revolutionary war, and for no other purpose whatever; no one at the time of its adoption dreaming that it would be used by the States to shield themselves from subsequently contracted liabilities." If the author will consult the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Chisholm vs. Georgia* (2 Dall., 479) he will find it expressly stated that claims against the States growing out of the Revolutionary war never could have been sued under the original Constitution. They represented the one class of claims which the Eleventh Amendment was not intended to cut off.

But an historical blunder of this sort does not reflect so seriously upon the author's credit as does the total loss of judicial temper which marks his concluding chapter upon "Speculating." This chapter is perhaps the most interesting in the volume. We have here the spectacle of a New York broker joining vigorously in the attack upon the Stock Exchange. Unfortunately, he follows the example of his eloquent comrades-in-arms (or, better, comrades-with-arms), and indulges freely in rhetoric. He represents the Stock Exchange as conducted solely in the interests of the stock-makers. It is merely "the conduit through which water is carried to the investor's pocket." "It is supposed to act as a sieve, but, . . . sieve-like, it is no obstruction to the passage of water." To his mind the Exchange does not even fulfil a useful function by supplying quotable values, and thus giving stability to business. "When securities are converted into footballs for gamblers to play with, they are pretty certain to be either too high or too low," and thus, "instead of being a balance wheel to the business of the country, the Stock Exchange is far more likely to be a disturbing factor."

In short, the entire institution is "an enemy to public morals and general business."

In support of these charges the author does state facts, and they are facts which deserve statement. It cannot, for instance, be too often repeated, that listing on the Exchange furnishes not the slightest guarantee as to the worthiness of securities. All brokers admit it, and the time may come when popular distrust will lead the Exchange to impose new duties upon its committee on applications for listing. Then, too, there is ground for the denial of the constantly repeated claim that the Exchange steadies values. When, as brokers admit, speculative orders outnumber investment orders a hundred to one, and the general tendency is to demand stocks that are rising and desert those that are falling, without thought as to dividend-paying qualities, there is grave reason to doubt whether the Exchange merits the eulogies which have been bestowed upon its steady qualities. It may also be true that stocks listed yield on the average smaller returns than outside investments. In fact, there are two economic reasons why this should be the case. In the first place, they have the advantage of instant convertibility. In the second place, the gambling instinct which leads men to invest in lotteries, though the certainty of loss increases with the size of the investment, may also lead them to invest in stocks where the probable smallness of the dividend is compensated by the hope of adding to the principal. But these are merely tendencies which in no wise justify our author's characterizations of listed securities. Throughout the entire chapter the judgments are passionate and exaggerated. The obvious benefit which the Exchange confers, in enabling business men at any instant to convert their securities into cash, is ignored. The fact that the Exchange facilitates the sale of American securities, especially their sale abroad, by furnishing an index of their probable value, is apparently unthought of. The entire arraignment is that of a prosecuting attorney who permits himself to be carried away by his eloquence and indignation.

Most of the evils connected with the Exchange are those inherent in speculative human nature. There is, however, one which our author is justified in believing that the rigid enforcement of wholesome legislation may mitigate. John Bright once said that adulteration is a legitimate form of competition. This is true only when the fact of the adulteration is admitted. Otherwise, it is fraud. The adulteration of stocks is generally of the latter sort.

When our author advocates that, in all our States, corporations which exist by the authority of the law be prohibited from issuing debentures or scrip not representing moneys actually paid into their treasuries, or proprietary interests whose values are to be determined by disinterested parties, he advocates a measure which the protection of the public against extortion and the protection of private investors against fraud alike demand. Fortunately, such laws are becoming more general. Insurance stocks in some States and bank stocks in all can now be relied upon to represent actual cash investments. When this shall hold true of all forms of corporate securities, European investments will be more frequent, American investments will be more secure, and the idea of riches be less dangerously dissociated from the idea of earnings.

The Philosophy of Kant, as contained in Extracts from his own Writings, selected and translated by John Watson, LL.D. Macmillan & Co. 1888. 12mo, pp. 356.

Mr. WATSON rightly anticipates an objection to his extracts, that "the work of a great author should be represented 'all in all, or not at all.'" But he as justly replies that "the writings of Kant, which are full of confusing repetitions that really mar their perfection of form, hardly deserve the same tenderness of treatment" that must be accorded "a faultless work of art like the *Republic* of Plato." Nevertheless, admitting the good judgment shown in the selections, the excellent character of the translations, the good print, and the general value of the work for technical class-room work, we have a more general criticism to pass. We have had translations enough of Kant. What the general student of philosophy wants to-day is an exposition.

Kant's obscurity of thought and style, his tortuous sentences and peculiar phraseology, and his meagreness of fact and illustrations, are the proverbs of philosophers: Translations can only transmit these defects into another language, where they are made tenfold worse by the necessity of making concessions to foreign idioms. Every one knows how intolerable it is to read the 'Kritik' in a translator's dress, unless he has first been initiated into the mysteries of its terms. We are convinced, however, that Kant can be expressed in as plain and simple English as was the philosophy of Locke, if his disciples will only condescend to interpret him. Prof. Royce and Prof. Schurman have both recently expressed themselves

to the same effect. Until this is done, the merits of the Kantian philosophy will not be properly appreciated, as they have not been appreciated by the scientific mind—witness Herbert Spencer, George Henry Lewes, and John Stuart Mill. Kantian scholars would, therefore, do a lasting service to philosophic thought if they would perform this plain duty instead of merely translating their master, and talking only among themselves in a language that is essentially esoteric in its nature.

The Registers of the Parish Church of Rochdale, in the County of Lancaster, from October, 1582, to March, 1616. Edited by Henry Fishwick. Rochdale: James Glegg. 1888. 8vo, pp. 371.

In this well-printed volume, the historian of Goosnargh and Kirkham has published the christenings, weddings, and burials of the parish of Rochdale. The editing is invisible, but we doubt not that the copying has been carefully and thoroughly made. There is nothing to notice except the bare names, and of these the principal are Aspinall, Ashton, Ashworth, Atkinson, Bamford, Banks, Baguley, Battersby, Belfield, Birch, Booth, Bradford, Brearley, Bridge, Briggs, Brook, Buckley, Butterworth, Byrom, Casson, Chadwick, Clegg, Collinge, Cowper, Crossley, Durdin, Dickson, Dodson, Dowson, Earnshaw, Eastwood, Entwistle, Farrer, Fielden, Fenton, Fish, Fitton, Fletcher, Frith, Garside, Gorelde, Greave, Greenhalgh, Greenroade, Greenwood, Gryme, Halliwell, Hallows, Hamer, Hanson, Hardman, Haslam, Haworth, Healey, Heyward, Hill, Holland, Hollas, Holroyde, Holt, Hopwood, Ingham, Jackson, Kaye, Kirshaw, Leache, Lees, Leigh, Lightowlers, Lorde, Lomax, Ludson, Marcroft, Mercer, Milne, Newall, Nuttall, Ogden, Radcliffe, Redferne, Rodes, Romsbotham, Rudd, Scelfield, Shaw, Shepheard, Shore, Stock, Stott, Sutcliffe, Taylor, Turnough, Walch, Ward, Wardle, Whitehead, Whittaker, Whitworth, Wolfenden, and Wolstenholm.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Aguirre, J. M. *Uncle Sam in Pontifical Robes*. G. W. Carleton & Co. 50 cents.
Arnold, E. L. *England as She Seems*. Frederick Warne & Co. 30 cents.
A Social Conspiracy, or Under the Ban. St. Paul, Minn.: Geo. C. Pound. 50 cents.
Bartholomew, J. *Elementary School Atlas*. Macmillan & Co. 30 cents.
Chisholm, G. G. *Longman's Junior School Geography*. Longmans, Green & Co. 45 cents.
Chisholm, G. G. *Longman's School Geography*. Longmans, Green & Co. \$1.05.
Crane, Rev. S. *Jesus the Christ*. Boston: Universalist Publishing House.
Daintrey, Laura. *Eros*. Belford, Clark & Co.

HENRY HOLT & CO.'s Important New Educational Works.

THE NEW EDITION of WHITNEY'S GERMAN GRAMMAR. Teachers' price, \$1.30; by mail, \$1.45.

In revising the work many additions and improvements, suggested by experience, have been introduced. All the matter has been put into two sizes of type, averaging much larger than in earlier editions. The new spelling of German words appears in brackets beside the old. The exercises, which formerly were scattered through the volume, have been excised, and a much fuller and more comprehensive series, provided with references, appear at the end. No fundamental changes have been made in the plan or structure of the book, even the paragraphing having been retained.

PACKARD'S ENTOMOLOGY for BEGINNERS. 12mo. Teachers' price, \$1.40; by mail, \$1.53.

This book not only starts the beginner in the study, but gives amateurs and dilettanti copious directions for collecting and preserving insects and forming cabinets. It also is intended as a handbook for the farmer, fruit-grower, and gardener. After supplying the fundamental knowledge which all these persons need, it refers each very fully and specifically to the detailed works which supply his special needs.

HOWELL'S DISSECTION OF THE DOG. Teachers' price, \$1.00; by mail, \$1.07.

Prepared originally for the author's own class at Johns Hopkins University, as a basis for the study of physiology.

HENRY HOLT & CO.,
NEW YORK.

Johns Hopkins University, BALTIMORE.

Announcements for the next academic year are now ready and will be sent on application.

The Anatomy of Negation.

By EDGAR SALTUS. 12mo, cloth, \$3.00.
Now Ready. Volume Second of the *Bankside Shakespeare*. (Published by the New York Shakespeare Society.)

The Taming of the (A) Shrew.

The Bankside is the only Paralleled and Line numbered edition. Will be completed in about 20 vols., at \$2.50 per volume. Send for descriptive circular. For sale by all Booksellers. Sent postpaid on receipt of price.

BRENTANO'S, { CHICAGO,
5 UNION SQUARE. { WASHINGTON,
PARIS.

Scribner & Welford's

LIST OF BOOKS

Suitable for Use in High-Class Schools,
Colleges, and Ladies' Schools.

An Elementary History of Art.

By N. D'Anvers. With a Preface by Prof. Roger Smith. An entirely new and enlarged edition in 2 vols. Vol. i, Architecture and Sculpture. Vol. ii, Painting, with 360 illustrations. Large crown 8vo, cloth, gilt top.

For students who desire thus to train their own minds, for those who wish to prepare themselves for Continental travel, and, above all, for pupils in schools of a high class, no handbook of Art History could be more suitable than this work.

Biographies of the Great Musicians.

Specially prepared for Schools, Amateurs, and Students of Music. Each volume strongly bound in decorated cloth. Price, per volume, \$1. Including,

Haydn, Schubert, Bach, Wagner,
Handel, Schumann, Weber, Rossini,
Mozart, Purcell, Mendelssohn,
English Church Composers.

Art Hand-Books.

A new series of Illustrated Text-Books of Art Education. Edited by E. J. Poynter, R.A. Each volume contains numerous illustrations, and is strongly bound for the use of students. Price, per volume, \$2.

I. PAINTING. Classic and Italian. By E. J. Poynter and P. R. Head.

II. — German, Flemish, and Dutch. By H. W. Buxton.

III. — English and American. By H. W. Buxton.

IV. — French and Spanish. By G. Smith.

V. ARCHITECTURE. Classic and Early Christian. By T. R. Smith.

VI. — Gothic and Renaissance. By T. R. Smith.

VII. SCULPTURE. Antique, Egyptian, and Greek. By G. Redford.

VIII. — Renaissance and Modern. By G. Redford.

Biographies of the Great Artists.

Specially prepared for Schools, Amateurs, and Students of Art. Each volume contains about 16 illustrations, including a portrait of the master, and is strongly bound in decorated cloth. Price, per volume, \$1.25, unless marked otherwise, viz.:

REYNOLDS — HOGARTH — GAINSBOROUGH AND CONSTABLE — LAWRENCE AND ROMNEY, \$1.00 — TURNER — WILKIE — LANDSEER — GIOTTO — FRA ANGELICO — FRA BARTOLOMEO — GHIRBerti AND DONATELLO, \$1.00 — MANTEGNA — LEONARDO DA VINCI — MICHEL ANGELO — RAPHAEL — TITIAN — TINTORETTO — CORREGGIO, \$1.00 — VELASQUEZ — MURILLO, \$1.00 — ALBRECHT DURER — THE LITTLE MASTERS — HOLBEIN — OVERBECK — REMBRANDT — RUBENS — VAN DYCK — DELLA ROBBIA, \$1.00 — WATTEAU, \$1.00 — VERNET — FIGURE PAINTERS OF HOLLAND — MEISSONIER, \$1.00 — CLAUDE.

Complete detailed list supplied.

** The above books sent upon receipt of advertised price. Catalogues of our regular stock, also complete lists of Bohn's Libraries, will be mailed, if desired, to those interested.

SCRIBNER & WELFORD, 743-745 BROADWAY, N. Y.

"The respectable and sometimes excellent translations of Bohn's Library have done for Literature what railroads have done for internal intercourse."—R. W. Emerson.

"I may say in regard to all manner of books, Bohn's Publication Series is the usefulest thing I know."—Thomas Carlyle.

"An important body of cheap literature, for which every living worker in this country who draws strength from the past has reason to be grateful."—Professor Henry Morley.

"The publishers are making constant additions, of an eminently acceptable character, to 'Bohn's Libraries.'"—Athenæum.

Bohn's Libraries.

CONTAINING

STANDARD WORKS OF EUROPEAN LITERATURE in the ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

With Dictionaries and other Books of Reference. Comprising in all translations from the French, German, Italian, Spanish, Scandinavian, Anglo-Saxon, Latin, and Greek.

700 Volumes, \$1.40 or \$2 each, with exceptions.

RECENT ADDITIONS.

VICTOR HUGO'S DRAMATIC WORKS. HERNANI—RUY BLAS—THE KING'S DIVERSION. Translated by Mrs. Newton Crosland and F. L. Slous. \$1.40.

THE LETTERS AND WORKS OF LADY MARY WORTLEY MONTAGU. Edited by her great-grandson, Lord Wharmcliffe; with additions and corrections derived from original MSS., illustrative Notes, and a Memoir by W. Moy Thomas. New Edition, Revised, in Two Vols., with Portraits. \$1.

"A most convenient reprint of Mr. Moy Thomas's admirable edition."—Athenæum

AN EGYPTIAN PRINCESS. An Historical Novel. By Georg Ebers. Translated by Emma S. Buchheim. \$1.40.

"The translator's rendering is easy and elegant."—Morning Post.

ADAM SMITH'S THE WEALTH OF NATIONS.

An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of. Reprinted from the Sixth Edition. With an Introduction by Ernest Belfort Bax. Two vols., \$4.

SENECA (L. ANNÆUS) ON BENEFITS. Addressed to Æbuntius Liberalis. Translated by Aubrey Stewart, M.A. \$1.40.

"This is a faithful rendering of the 'De Beneficiis' in plain but Academic English."—St. James's Gazette.

RANKE'S HISTORY OF THE LATIN AND TEUTONIC NATIONS. Translated by P. A. Ashworth. \$1.40.

HEINE'S TRAVEL-PICTURES. Translated by Francis Storr. \$1.40.

"Mr. Storr's brilliant version."—Academy.

GOETHE'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH ZETTER. Selected, Translated, and Edited by A. D. Coleridge, M.A. \$1.40.

THE STUDENT'S HANDBOOK OF HISTORICAL GEOLOGY. By A. J. Jukes-Browne, B.A., F.G.S. \$2.40.

PAUSANIAS'S DESCRIPTION OF GREECE. Translated by A. R. Shilleto, M.A. 2 vols. \$4.

HOFFMANN'S TALES. The Serapion Brethren. First Portion. Translated by Lieut.-Col. A. Ewing. \$1.40.

HAUFF'S TALES. The Caravan—The Sheik of Alexandria—The Inn in the Spessart. Translated by S. Mendel. \$1.40.

GOLDSMITH'S WORKS. A New Edition. By J. W. M. Gibbs. 5 vols. \$7.

A SELECTION.

ANTONINUS.—THE THOUGHTS OF M. AULIURES \$1.40.

ADDISON'S WORKS. 6 vols. \$8.

BAX'S MANUAL OF THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. \$2.

BOSWELL'S LIFE OF JOHNSON (Centenary Edition, edited by Napier). 6 vols. \$8.40.

COLERIDGE'S WORKS. 6 vols. \$8.40.

FAIRHOLT'S COSTUME IN ENGLAND (Dillon). 2 vols. \$4.

LESSING'S LAOKOON. Translated.

LESSING'S DRAMATIC WORKS. 2 vols. Translated.

MILTON'S PROSE WORKS. 5 vols.

MOLIÈRE'S DRAMATIC WORKS. 2 vols. Translated.

\$4.20.

PEPYS'S DIARY. 4 vols. \$8.

PLUTARCH'S LIVES. 4 vols. (Stewart & Long's trans.) \$5.00.

SPINOZA'S CHIEF WORKS. Translated. 2 vols. \$4.

STAUNTON'S CHESS HANDBOOK. \$2.

Important Text-Books.

POLITICAL SCIENCE.

American Political Economy.

By Francis Bowen, Professor of Natural Religion and Moral Philosophy in Harvard College. 8vo, \$2.50.

This treatise presents views compatible with the idea that "every country has a political economy of its own, suitable to its own physical circumstances of position on the globe, and to the character, habits, and institutions of the people."

"If our members of Congress would vote themselves a copy of this book and read it, fewer wild schemes would be concocted by them, and a great saving of time and the people's money would be secured."—The Philadelphia Age.

Political Economy.

By Arthur Latham Perry, Professor in Williams College. Crown 8vo, \$2.50. Professor Perry's book has passed through many editions, and has recently been subjected to a thorough revision and recasting. It has stood excellently the test of the class-room, and has been adopted by many of the chief educational institutions in this country.

"Your book interests students more than any I have ever instructed from."—Pres. T. D. Woolsey, Yale College.

"As a manual for general reading and popular instruction, Prof. Perry's book is far superior to any work on the subject before issued in the United States."—New York Times.

Introduction to Political Economy.

Revised edition. 12mo, \$1.50.

"This work is not meant in any way to take the place of its author's larger treatise. It is not an abridgment of that work, but a separate treatise, intended primarily for the use of students and readers whose time for study is small, but who wish to learn the broad principles of the science thoroughly and well.

We need scarcely add, with respect to a writer so well known as he, that his thinking is sound as well as acute, or that his doctrines are those which the greatest masters of political science have approved."—The New York Evening Post.

Political Science.

Or, The State Theoretically and Practically Considered. By Theodore D. Woolsey, D.D., LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo, \$5.00.

"No work on Political Science has ever been published in America which covers so wide a ground and which treats the subject so fairly and impartially, and with so thorough knowledge and judgment."—The Boston Transcript.

MENTAL SCIENCE.

Psychology.

By James McCosh, D.D., LL.D., President of Princeton College. I. The Cognitive Powers. II. The Motive Powers. 2 vols., 12mo, each \$1.50.

The first volume contains an analysis of the operations of the senses and of their relation to the intellectual processes, and devotes considerable space to a discussion of Sense-perception, from the physiological side, accompanied by appropriate cuts. The second volume continues the subject with a discussion of the power of the Conscience, Emotions, and Will.

"This book is written in a clear and simple style; it breathes a sweet and winning spirit, and it is inspired by a noble purpose. In these respects it is a model of what a text-book should be."—Prof. William DeW. Hyde, Bowdoin College.

Elements of Physiological Psychology.

By George T. Ladd, D.D., Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Yale University. With numerous illustrations. 1 vol., 8vo, \$4.50.

"His erudition and his broad-mindedness are on a par with each other; and his volume will probably, for many years to come, be the standard work of reference on the subject."—Prof. William James, in the Nation.

** All correspondence is solicited in reference to copies for examination and terms of introduction.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS,

743-745 Broadway, New York.